DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 335 UD 034 318

AUTHOR Gaddy, Barbara, Ed.
TITLE Including Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students in Standards-Based Reform: A Report on McREL's Diversity Roundtable I.
INSTITUTION Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning, Aurora, CO.
PUB DATE 1999-09-00
NOTE 98p.
AVAILABLE FROM Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning, 2550 South Parker Road, Suite 500, Aurora, CO 80014-1678. Tel: 303-337-0990; Fax: 303-337-3005; Web site: http://www.mcrel.org.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Cultural Differences; *Diversity (Student); *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Equal Education; Evaluation Methods; *Language Minorities; Student Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This document presents four research-based papers that were the catalyst for discussions at the first Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning diversity roundtable in 1998. The goals established for this roundtable included: building participants' capacity for working with diverse populations; providing a catalyst for participants to critically examine and discuss pertinent issues; promoting the need for improving the alignment of instructional practice with standards-based reform; and raising the awareness of the need for procedures, policies, and practices to address the needs of diverse students. Chapter 1, "Introduction," highlights the increasing diversity characterizing the nation, communities, and schools. Chapter 2, "A Better Education for Every Child: The Dilemma for Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students" (Sharon Nelson-Barber), states that a generic approach to reform is ineffective and inequitable because the qualities of good teaching vary by cultural context. Chapter 3, "School Reform and Alignment of Standards" (Margarita Calderon), examines effective instruction for language minority students. Chapter 4, "Personal Perspectives on Organizational Issues in the Standards-Based Education Movement" (William Demmert), provides a framework for creating a standards-based system that reflects the variables influencing students' success. Chapter 5, "Assessment of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students: Considerations for the 21st Century" (Aida Walqui), discusses how student demographics have changed over recent decades and how diverse students have fared in the education system. Chapter 6, "Conclusion," summarizes issues raised in the papers and roundtable discussions, noting major areas in which educators can initiate or strengthen actions to improve the education of diverse students. (Papers contain references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 455 335

Including Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students in Standards-Based Reform:
A Report on McREL's Diversity Roundtable I

September 1999

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD034318

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This publication would not have been possible without the dedicated efforts of many people. Deep appreciation is extended to each of the writers. Their knowledge of the research findings and effective practices on culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) student populations has helped to provide educators with the knowledge they need to include CLD students in standards-based reform efforts. Sincere thanks also go to members of the planning committee who provided the guidance for the design and planning of the roundtable and contributed to the success of this publication.

Sincere gratitude is extended to the Regions VII and IX Comprehensive Assistance Centers, the Eisenhower High Plains Consortium for Mathematics and Science at McREL, and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). Staff members from all of these organizations, along with other McREL staff members, assisted with the quality assurance review process. Grateful acknowledgments are also extended to Barbara Gaddy who provided editing expertise.

Thanks to all of the McREL staff who provided assistance with this publication. Special thanks are extended to Lou Cicchinelli, Ceri Dean, Nilda Garcia Simms, and Audrey Peralez for their support, helpful suggestions, and dedicated efforts; Linda Brannan for her assistance with the references; and Kathleen McFarland, Marla Fultz, Cathy Warner, Lynn Bishop, and Deb Van Sicklin for administrative support.

Finally, sincere thanks go to the participants who attended the diversity roundtable. Their dedication to culturally and linguistically diverse students and their participation at the roundtable will help to ensure that these students reap the benefits of standards-based reform.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface iii

Chapter One
Introduction 1

Chapter Two
A Better Education for Every Child: The Dilemma for Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students
by Sharon Nelson-Barber, Ph.D 3

Chapter Three
School Reform and Alignment of Standards
by Margarita Calderón, Ph.D 23

Chapter Four
Personal Perspectives on Organizational Issues in the Standards-Based Education Movement
by William Demmert, Ph.D 47

Chapter Five
Assessment of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students: Considerations for the 21st Century
by Aida Walqui, Ph.D. 55

Chapter Six
Conclusion 85

PREFACE

This document is a compilation of the four research-based papers that served as the catalyst for discussions at the first Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) diversity roundtable held October 22-23, 1998 in Aurora, Colorado. It will be distributed to the 54 roundtable participants to reinforce the essential points of the presentations and discussions. It is our hope that this document also will serve as a catalyst for further thought about the issues, provide a way to begin discussions with colleagues, and stimulate change in practice and policy.

This publication also will be distributed to key individuals in the seven-state region that McREL serves, including chief state school officers, appropriate staff at state departments of education, intermediate service agencies, and other federally funded service providers. In addition, it will be available on McREL's Web site (http://www.mcrel.org) and will be mailed to those who request a copy. For readers other than roundtable participants, the document can serve as an introduction to the issues related to culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students in standards-based reform and as a resource for strategies to address CLD students' needs, whether indirectly through professional development or directly through instructional strategies. We hope that readers seriously consider and use the suggested practices presented in the various papers. Further, we hope that this document inspires readers to study the topic further.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document has six chapters: an introduction; four research-based papers, which were commissioned for the roundtable; and a conclusion. Chapter One sets the tone by highlighting the increasing diversity that characterizes our nation, our communities, and our schools. This chapter also reviews the process of designing the roundtables and the goals that were identified by the members of the roundtable planning committee.

Chapters Two through Five are the papers presented at the October 1998 roundtable. Although each of the papers addresses standards-based reform and the implications for CLD students, each of the writers approached the topic from a different perspective and each focused on a different population. Consequently, the authors' use of terms describing CLD populations differs. For example, in Chapter Two, the author offers comments and strategies for working with all students who are culturally and linguistically diverse. However, she also focuses in particular on students from American Indian, Alaska Native, and Pacific Island populations, whom she describes as "indigenous" students. In Chapters Three, Four, and Five, respectively, the authors primarily use the terms "language minority students," "culturally and linguistically diverse students," and "English language learners." All of these terms refer to students who are non-English speakers, regardless of cultural background, and who are in the process of acquiring English as their second language. These students also are sometimes known as "limited English proficient," or LEP, students.

In their discussions of the implications of standards-based reform for CLD students, the writers raise our awareness about the issues that CLD students face. They also provide suggestions and models for helping teachers acquire the information and skills they need to improve instruction for these students.

In Chapter Two, Dr. Sharon Nelson-Barber provokes our thinking by stating that a generic approach to reform is ineffective and inequitable because the qualities of "good teaching" vary by cultural context. She provides examples of sociocultural influences and explains the importance of educators becoming knowledgeable about such influences on student learning. Her paper concludes with a set of questions that can be used to guide the development of teaching, administrative, and organizational practices that support multicultural students' achievement of standards.

In Chapter Three, Dr. Margarita Calderón focuses on effective instruction for language minority (LM) students. Calderón explains how the "traditional" education system erects barriers to language minority students' success and operates out of misconceptions about the factors that shape these students' school experiences. In this paper, readers will find guidance for developing an effective program for language minority students. Calderón also describes a professional development program that helps teachers acquire the knowledge and skills they need to help language minority students succeed.

In Chapter Four, Dr. William Demmert provides a framework for creating a standards-based system that reflects the variables that influence students' success. Demmert's discussion of the traditional ways of educating a Tlingit man-child emphasizes the role of mentors, the importance of congruence between culture and educational methods, and how high expectations for performance are a motivating force for achievement. Demmert draws on his personal experiences as a Tlingit to help us think about how parents and community members can support student learning in a standards-based system.

In Chapter Five, Dr. Aida Walqui begins with an overview of how the demographics of the school population have changed over the last several decades and how diverse students have fared in the education system. She presents a number of misconceptions about the education of English language learners and offers a historical perspective on the inclusion of such learners in standards-based reform. Walqui emphasizes that English language learners face many challenges in their education since they must acquire sociolinguistic proficiency as well as literacy in a new language and subject matter knowledge. She addresses the importance of opportunity to learn standards and content standards for English as a Second Language. In addition, Walqui discusses the use of authentic assessment for students who are English language learners and provides examples from several high schools.

Finally, Chapter Six draws together the issues raised in the papers and through the roundtable discussions. This concluding chapter presents five major areas in which educators can initiate or strengthen actions to improve the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Taken together, the papers and the conclusion present a multitude of ways in which educators can meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students. They inform and inspire us. Most important, they encourage us to realize that diversity — especially bilingualism — is a national asset and valuable resource.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The student population in United States schools is more diverse — both culturally and linguistically — than it has been at any time since the early decades of the 20th century. According to the 1990 Census, more than one-fifth of school-age children come from language minority families (homes in which languages other than English are spoken). Between 1979 and 1995, the number of school-age children who spoke a language other than English at home and had difficulty speaking English almost doubled, growing from 1.25 million in 1979 to 2.44 million in 1995. It is estimated that nearly half of our nation's school children soon will be young people of diverse populations. As we enter this exciting era, we should take the opportunity to reflect on the positive aspects of cultural diversity and learn from one another's cultures.

The increasing diversity the United States as a whole is experiencing is characteristic of the seven states that the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) serves (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming) through its regional educational laboratory contract with the U.S. Department of Education. Although these states historically have had diverse populations — Mexican Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans — an influx of recent immigrants is swelling the numbers of English language learners in the region's schools. Educators across the region have expressed the need for new information and skills to address the needs of these students.

In response and as part of its leadership role in the areas of curriculum, learning, and instruction, McREL has planned a series of three roundtables on the implications of standards-based education for diverse populations. The first roundtable, held in October 1998, focused on culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) populations. That roundtable is the subject of this report. The next two roundtables will focus, respectively, on at-risk populations and special needs populations.

Diversity Roundtable Design

In keeping with McREL's collaborative approach to working with educators in the region, a roundtable planning committee comprised of representatives from the region and other experts from across the country was convened to establish the goals and expected outcomes for the series of diversity roundtables. The committee identified the following four goals:

1. Build participants' capacity for working with diverse populations by enhancing participants' understanding of related research.

2. Provide a catalyst for participants to critically examine and discuss pertinent issues.

3. Promote the need for improving the alignment of instructional practice with standards-based reform.

4. Raise awareness of the need for procedures, policies, and practices to address the needs of diverse students.

The planning committee defined the following three outcomes for participants at the first roundtable:

1. Become familiar with current research findings and effective practices for educating culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students.

2. Develop a basic understanding of the implications of standards-based reform for CLD students and educators.

3. Identify strategies that facilitate the inclusion of CLD students in the standards-based reform movement in the region.

The first roundtable was designed around research-based papers prepared specifically for the event by four national experts. The event consisted of general sessions and small-group activities to provide participants with opportunities to interact with the national experts. Opportunities for questions and audience participation were abundant and strongly encouraged in both the general sessions and in small-group activities.

The general sessions served as forums for the writers to present their papers. Each writer was given 30 minutes to present his or her paper and to highlight the salient points. Participants referred to a set of listening points during the presentations to focus their listening for specific information. As each scholar presented his or her paper, participants identified the following:

1. concrete strategies;

2. clarifications or amplifications that were needed; and

3. questions they would like answered or addressed.

Reflecting on personal beliefs about CLD learners and on the content of the presentations was an integral part of the roundtable. At the conclusion of each presentation, participants reflected on two questions:

1. Based on the presentation, what are the implications for your practice?

2. How can you share this information with others?

After participants reflected on these questions, they divided into small discussion groups during which they had an opportunity to interact with each author and then to discuss effective

strategies for teaching CLD students. Participants then reorganized into different small groups, each of which focused on a particular paper. As a culminating activity, each of these groups gave a presentation on what they learned as a result of their discussions. The papers that served as the catalyst for these discussions are presented in the following chapters.

CHAPTER TWO

A BETTER EDUCATION FOR EVERY CHILD: THE DILEMMA FOR TEACHERS OF CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE STUDENTS

by

Sharon Nelson-Barber, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

This paper asserts that increasing student diversity combined with high standards for student achievement presents a dilemma for teachers, since schools must make certain that all students meet these standards. Unfortunately, most teachers continue to believe that "good teaching is good teaching," even though research suggests that "good teaching" in one cultural context may not transfer to another. Several examples of effective practice are provided to demonstrate that teachers must develop a number of essential skills, including ethnographic and analytical abilities, in order to gain cultural insights and connect with their students. In addition, five guiding questions are provided to help educators complement constructivist approaches to learning with sociocultural understandings of students' needs.

Dr. Sharon Nelson-Barber, a sociolinguist, is a senior research associate at WestEd in San Francisco, California. She is a consultant to the Language, Culture and Equity Initiative, which develops school/community partnerships to improve services to students from diverse linguistic, cultural, and racial backgrounds. Dr. Nelson-Barber also chairs the Indigenous Education Collabora-tive, a joint effort of the regional educational laboratories that responds to the needs of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Pacific Island communities.

INTRODUCTION

There is no question . . . that the increasing diversity of our peoples, and the economic and social imperatives of our time, require new visions and new ways of schooling, specifically: a high quality curriculum preparing all students for the 21st century and their place in a diverse society, and a commitment once and for all to ending the achievement gap between racial, linguistic and cultural groups. (Olson et al., 1994, p. 6)

As we approach the millennium, our nation's education improvement efforts seek to establish clear and definitive standards of excellence for all American schools. The promise of higher standards of effectiveness in the classroom and greater teacher accountability implies more equitable opportunities for students to achieve academic and social success. At the same time, the increasing plurality in

today's classrooms presents a dilemma for educators as they strive to capture what is critical for students to know and be able to do in specified content areas and to define how well students must perform to be considered content proficient.

In recent years, student achievement has come to be measured against a set of high-level standards rather than against the achievement of other children. As a result, the onus now lies with school systems to make certain that all students meet these standards, though their needs may differ (Mitchell, 1994). Those concerned about compatibility with community values work to include locally developed standards. Others believe it should be possible to devise a set of very broad standards for all students and measure success according to a common set of criteria, while remaining flexible about the specific means for addressing standards and determining student achievement. Still, after countless hours of discussion, thousands of pages of print, and millions of dollars in implementation, American classrooms do not yet offer a better education for every child.

Jamentz (1998) asserts, "standards-based reform is as much about confronting strongly held beliefs and values about schooling as it is about creating . . . documents and assessment tools" (p. vi). Thus, in addition to functional needs for, say, adequate resources and support, there is an added layer of needing to understand the context or limitations of individual perspectives. Given teacher "ambivalence about the possibility of setting agreed-upon standards that are both challenging and attainable by all students" (Jamentz, 1998, p. 4), there is little argument about the need to prepare teachers who are more knowledgeable and more reflective about their practices. Current formulations of the proposed national standards across subject areas do not represent a deep enough understanding of the implications of linguistic, cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity for American education.

What Teachers Should Know and Do

Much of the uncertainty about the abilities of diverse students is embedded in the mainstream teacher's general lack of awareness and sensitivity to the unique needs and issues of students from different backgrounds. Most mainstream educators hold the position that "good teaching is good teaching" — that one can pack up one's effective practices, move to a different situation with a different set of students, and expect to be reasonably effective. Which leads us to the previously unexamined question: What are the standards of excellence for teachers that are likely to improve education for our diverse student population?

A growing body of ethnographic classroom research documents the qualities of "good teaching" specific to particular cultural contexts and demonstrates how these abilities are not easily transferred to new situations (cf., Au, 1980; Delpit, 1995; Foster, 1998; Heath, 1983; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lipka, 1991; Mohatt & Erickson, 1981; Nelson-Barber, 1985; Philips, 1983). Teachers who are successful with diverse learners are able to fashion curricula that are directly linked to students' cultural experiences, reflect local values and traditions, and require some understanding of culturally determined preferences for thinking and interacting. For example, culturally acceptable communication patterns vary for different populations. Teachers

need a solid understanding and appreciation of such diverse communication patterns to facilitate participation by all students in classroom discussions. Establishing the conditions that engender trust between teachers and students rests in part on understanding particular cultural values. Helping students link their personal experiences with classroom learning activities requires an appreciation for and understanding of those experiences.

The point is not that teachers need to share culture with students to be effective. Rather, teachers who are insiders to such knowledge can inform instruction and assist other teachers in learning how particular students learn best, how to organize schooling, how to discipline children, and so forth. Teachers who come from their students' communities as well as teachers who have gained valuable knowledge by working in students' communities can be effective. In addition to understanding content and ways to teach content, they develop high-quality relationships with their students, which helps them better understand these students.

Unfortunately, many teachers who are successful with diverse populations shy away from sharing their strategies and approaches. They frequently perceive that mainstream teachers presented with such experiences and perspectives do not give them credence, particularly if these experiences and perspectives fall outside of what such mainstream teachers know to be "good" or "progressive" practice as defined in current educational literature. Truthfully, many educators, including those who teach teachers, know little or nothing about the experiences and perspectives of teachers who live and work in diverse cultural communities. Teacher preparation programs only recently have begun to consider, as part of the admissions process, prospective candidates' previous experiences living or working in multicultural communities. Nevertheless we are far from making such experiences a requirement for acceptance into teacher education programs.

Experiences with widely diverse populations are critical and should be embraced by all educators. The importance of this approach must become a central focus of the discourse and part of the knowledge base if proposed reforms are to benefit all students. Improvement efforts must not proceed as they have in the past with the assumption that what is good for the mainstream is good for all communities (cf., Eisenhart, Finkel, & Marion, 1996) or that, once in place, whatever has been developed can be modified to suit the needs of "other" children (cf., Bartolome, 1994; Delpit, 1995). Educators and communities must collaborate during the initial stages of conceptualizing and developing standards rather than simply review material to detect biases after the work has been virtually completed.

Unexamined Assumptions and Practices

To better illustrate some of the ways in which a generic approach to reform is ineffective and inequitable, it is useful to describe student differences that have implications for the instructional approaches and strategies teachers choose. These differences include those that are rooted in varying world views; in approaches to learning and problem solving; in communication styles, strategies, and uses (including ways of demonstrating knowledge); and in cultural values such as the individual's relationship to particular kinds of knowledge (e.g., who should know what, what knowledge should be made public, who should share what knowledge). Many of the

pedagogical and social issues that arise in American indigenous communities offer excellent examples of the often-unexamined assumptions and practices that challenge the implementation of equitable reform.

The American Indigenous Experience

Indigenous peoples of the Americas (American Indian, Alaska Native, and Pacific Island populations) have rich histories and cultural heritages that have helped prepare future generations for meaningful and productive lives. Historically, elders have taken on much of the responsibility for teaching new generations the skills, traditions, and knowledge of their people. In everyday situations, children have been taught to work cooperatively and collectively and to reflect on what they have learned from life's daily "lessons." This experiential, hands-on education in a real-world context has featured the most authentic assessment system possible: the daily challenges of life itself. Performance on various "assessment" tasks has determined whether people will live or die and whether a tribe's culture will survive.

A Yup'ik (Eskimo) colleague describes how, at the age of nine, his father asked him to begin observing his surroundings every morning. "Go out and absorb all you can," instructed his father, "the sky, the temperature, the wind, the smells." Without fail, he followed this regimen into adulthood, the fruits of these observations being a keen ability to recognize subtle differences in snowdrift patterns, changes in wind direction, celestial configurations, snow color gradations, and more (George, personal communication, 1998). This developed knowledge base enables him to recognize thin ice, predict the weather, and navigate home in blizzard conditions — specialized abilities that make the difference for survival in the unforgiving conditions of western Alaska.

Similarly, a Chamorro colleague from the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands explains how her brothers learned to fish, a process that included a great deal of independent activity. cWhen it is time to learn certain things, a young boy may be taken out to the sea and left to learn for himself" (Atalig, personal communication, 1996). These strategies reflect the approach of guiding, facilitating, and setting up a circumstance through which the child can learn. Rather than giving direct instruction, an uncle or grandfather encourages a kind of apprenticeship that urges children to observe and test their learnings as they are given increasing responsibility. Full responsibility for a task indicates mastery.

It is interesting to note that such traditions of education in indigenous communities that emphasize life experience, cooperation, and reflection in meaningful contexts exemplify some of the best elements of the research-based instruction called for by current school improvement efforts (see Table 2.1).

The research of WestEd's Indigenous Education Collaborative, which studies the educational cultures of indigenous students in a variety of settings, validates the currency of these features in the lives of today's indigenous students (see also Au & Kawakami, 1994; Lipka, 1994; Philips, 1983, Swisher & Deyhle, 1987). Indigenous teachers with whom we collaborate in the

mainland United States, in Alaska, and in a number of the Pacific Islands of Micronesia offer rich examples of how to draw on students' well-developed ways of knowing, learning, and problem solving (cf., Lipka, 1998; Nelson-Barber & Trumbull, in press; Trumbull, Nelson-Barber, & Mitchell, in press).

Table 2.1
Selected Features of Indigenous and Reformed Pedagogies

Indigenous Pedagogy	Reformed Pedagogy
• Concepts are taught in meaningful contexts and serve authentic purposes.	• Concepts are taught in meaningful contexts, in more authentic ways.
• Adults serve as models and facilitators, guiding children to learn by observing and doing.	• Adults serve as models and facilitators; teachers are encouraged to go beyond strictly verbal methods of instruction.
• Children are encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning.	• Students are encouraged to take responsibility for their learning.
• Children are encouraged to evaluate their learning.	• Students are encouraged to reflect on their learning and self-evaluate.
• Children are allowed choices about when and how to display learning (e.g., choices about being tested).	• New forms of assessment, such as portfolios, allow more student choice.

Unlike many teachers of multicultural classrooms in the United States, the indigenous teachers with whom we work come from the same communities as their students, are knowledgeable about local language, and have an expressed interest in maintaining local culture. Our collaborations focus on capturing their guiding frameworks and thinking because these educators exhibit highly specialized skill in tailoring content, using local vernacular, and using cultural knowledge to build relationships with students, all of which are critical to teaching success in their settings.

Although there are certainly idiosyncrasies in pedagogy across these classrooms, these teachers use common strategies that are grounded in their community values and lifestyles. They teach concepts in the contexts in which they will be needed. Adults (teachers, parents, elders, aides) and older peers serve as models, guides, or facilitators rather than as direct instructors. Typically, children have considerable responsibility for their own learning, often working together in small groups to solve real-world problems or to accomplish tasks. It is commonly viewed as inappropriate to directly compare children with one another, as is typical in norm-referenced testing. Children have latitude to choose when they will demonstrate their mastery of a particular task or competence, an approach that supports autonomy, self-evaluation, and perseverance until mastery is achieved.

One might guess, then, that today's indigenous students have a decided advantage over other students. However, although much of this approach could serve as a model for reformed pedagogy, most teachers are not aware that this is the case, or do they know how to gain access to

their indigenous students' culture-based knowledge (Ascher, 1991, D'Arnbrosio, 1987; (Frankenstein & Powell, 1994).

Indigenous Traditions and the Constructivist Approach

To understand the school performance of indigenous students, their orientation to learning and knowledge and the ways of thinking and doing that are valued by their community, teachers must have experience and knowledge about students' home and community lives. Only then can they accurately interpret student behavior and motives and judge their abilities and potential. Teachers' cultural understandings and ability to communicate with and motivate students on the basis of these understandings can be critical to student learning. If students feel that teachers do not present material clearly, it may be because these teachers are unfamiliar with local rhetorical norms and, therefore, do not speak in ways that are easily understood by students. Teachers may be impatient because they do not know local norms for communicating, such as how long to wait before expecting students to respond or how to recognize nonverbal forms of response. They may stereotypically view indigenous students as "silent." In such situations, teachers may lower performance expectations not because students are not capable, but because teachers have misinterpreted community values and attitudes about education.

In an experimental summer program for Sioux children, Dumont (1972) found that "the more teaching and learning was moved into the cultural complex of the Sioux community, the more students talked, and as it moved within the cultural complex of the school, the more silent they became" (p. 347). In other words, children's relative participation or silence was directly related to how teacher-student and student-student learning exchanges were structured. When teachers used conventional nonindigenous ways of exercising authority and enforced a "school" definition of learning (far removed from the experiential learning promoted within the community), students simply stopped talking and otherwise refused to participate.

Susan Philips' (1983) landmark study of the classrooms of Warm Springs Indian students in Oregon documented critical participation structures and communication patterns that are required in order for teachers to successfully bridge home and classroom learning. More recent observations of Inuit, Cree, and Mohawk teachers reveal similar procedures and practices. McAlpine and Taylor (1993) found that teachers from all three of these groups tend to structure classrooms in ways that allow children to learn from each other as well as from teachers. The teachers they observed did not seem to exercise overt social control; instead, they chose to share control with their students, who had great latitude to interact with peers.

Researchers Eriks-Brophy and Crago (1993) studied how successful Inuit teachers in northern Quebec adapted classroom discourse practices to their students' communication patterns. Rather than asking individual students to answer questions, teachers allowed the whole group to call out answers. At times, an individual student would respond and the group would repeat the response in chorus. In addition, teachers did not always directly evaluate the correctness of the group's response after each question. Instead, they gave indirect feedback by eliciting further contributions or by using nonverbal cues.

During one of my early visits to a classroom in Alaska, I observed an Athabaskan elementary school teacher standing at the front of the class with her arms crossed, hands grasping her elbows. As she spoke to the class, she moved her right index finger slightly, as if she were tapping her elbow. I did not hear explicit directives to the children, but did see that students were actively engaged in their work and maintained consistent eye contact with the teacher, raising their eyebrows from time to time. When a child returned to the room from another class, the teacher raised her eyebrows and looked toward several piles of work sheets. The student immediately moved to the papers, selected a sheet, and returned to his or her seat. The children did not speak a great deal; however, when the teacher asked whether they understood the lesson, those who looked up also raised their eyebrows, seeming to affirm that they did, in fact, understand. The teacher moved among the children, talking to the group, working with individual students, helping them with the task they were expected to complete. At this point the children became more animated; they talked to one another, went to get water, or even left to use the restroom, but completed the assignment.

I was beginning to understand that this Athabaskan teacher was adept in her use of nonverbal cues as directives. By looking at a student and moving her hand in a certain way, she directed the child to a particular handout or page. She did not have to take away precious verbal time from the lesson to handle logistics. Nevertheless, a later discussion with local administrators who were not from the local community (nor originally from Alaska) revealed a different take on the lesson. They saw few opportunities for classroom interaction between teacher and students and had concluded that indigenous teachers do not require children to respond in class. They also judged that the classroom was poorly managed, concluding that indigenous teachers need to develop "teacher eyes" because kids move about at will, making classes "chaotic."

This scenario exemplifies the ways in which mainstream educators apply assumptions from their own contexts and expect students to adhere to rules, yet have little or no knowledge of local assumptions and expectations about practices and procedures that lead students to classroom success. The fact is that such differences between indigenous and nonindigenous approaches to acquiring and organizing knowledge have implications for teaching, assessment, and learning. As noted earlier, indigenous children often are expected to learn through observation and direct experience, rather than from explicit, verbal instruction. Concepts children are learning are viewed as interconnected, and skills are learned in meaningful contexts, which, according to proponents of apprenticeship models and situated cognition, are appropriate for all students (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989).

These traditional, indigenous ways of learning are compatible with the more integrated constructivist approach that recognizes students as active learners who, to learn at the deepest levels, must connect classroom experiences to their existing knowledge structures, which derive in part from real-world experiences. The kind of assessment that logically follows from such instruction also occurs in meaningful contexts. Ideally, it is embedded in or integrated with instruction. The type of assessment tools that artificially isolate disparate bits of information (as most multiple choice tests do, for example) is compatible neither with the constructivist approach nor with indigenous ways of demonstrating understanding or skill. Similarly, relying on

questioning or recitation for both instruction and assessment of indigenous students is incongruous with cultural norms (Swisher & Deyhle, 1992).

Understanding Sociocultural Influences

Although indigenous students, other students of color, and students who come from poor communities have been underserved by our schools, the widespread impetus to reform suggests that existing curricula, instructional methods, and assessments have not been appropriate for many other students as well. Some students have simply coped or gone along with the program better than others. The kinds of changes proposed represent a direction that advocates of "diverse" students have long recommended — a stronger link between what is taught in school and what is experienced in life outside of school.

The problem is that surface potential and good intentions will not automatically translate to improved instruction for underserved students. Assumptions about deficits based on the failure to understand sociocultural influences on learning are particularly harmful. The terms "disadvantaged" or "at-risk" are disturbing because they seem to identify individual students as the source of the problem rather than the larger social system. Perhaps the term "disenfranchised," which places responsibility on outside forces rather than on the student or his or her social group, conveys the social reality more accurately. However, this term risks implying that underserved students are in passive roles only — overlooking their active resistance to such forces. Students who are members of certain demographic groups are, of course, at some disadvantage when they go to school, but disadvantage is not something inherent; it is transactional. Students are disadvantaged with regard to something or by something because of the ways in which education is provided. Secada (1992) suggests that such an assumption is an example of how our society transforms what is essentially a social issue into a personal psychological issue and how achievement has come to define a student's ability rather than being seen largely as a function of opportunity.

Thus, a constructivist view of learners, one that recognizes students as active meaning-makers, must be complemented with a sociocultural perspective that recognizes the importance of social and cultural systems and their associated values and expectations on student learning. Nelson-Barber and Trumbull (1995) have compared the constructivist and sociocultural approaches to education and summarized their findings (see Table 2.2). Although they argue that both views contribute to understanding classroom learning (cf., Cobb, 1994), they clearly emphasize the sociocultural elements as imperatives if teachers are to be effective in multicultural classrooms.

The research of WestEd's Indigenous Education Collaborative, which studies the educational cultures of indigenous students in a variety of settings, validates the currency of these features in the lives of today's indigenous students (see also Au & Kawakami, 1994; Lipka, 1994; Philips, 1983; Swisher & Deyhle 1987). Indigenous teachers with whom we collaborate in the mainland United States, in Alaska, and in a number of the Pacific Islands of Micronesia offer rich examples of how to draw on students' well-developed ways of knowing, learning, and

problem solving (cf., Lipka, 1998; Nelson-Barber & Trumbull, in press; Trumbull, Nelson-Barber, & Mitchell, in press).

Table 2.2
Constructivist Theory vs. Sociocultural Theory

Constructivist Theory	Sociocultural Theory
View of Learning (focus on individual psychological processes) • Students actively construct knowledge. They are not passive recipients of information based on existing schemata. • Learning need not proceed hierarchically from simple skills to complex thought; young learners engage in complex thinking. • Students should be able to participate in the construction of their own curriculum and set their own learning goals.	*View of Learning (focus on social situatedness of learning)* • Learning is a social act, situated in a social and cultural context, in interaction with other members of a community (whether in school or in other settings). • Students' learning cannot be understood without reference to the sociocultural situation. • Schools have their own cultures, as do the various disciplines in some sense, and enculturation into these various cultures is one of the school's primary tasks. • Everything that takes place in school, community, and home is culture based.
Inferences about the Role of Teachers • Teachers should guide and facilitate learning rather than "dispense knowledge." • Teachers should be active, inquiring learners themselves. • Teachers should have professional expertise and engage in the design of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.	*Inferences about the Role of Teachers* • The job of teachers is to mediate between students' personal meanings and those of the culture(s) of school. • Teachers need to be cross-cultural experts, facilitating communication among students and between community and school.
Inferences about Curriculum and Instruction • The curriculum should be concept based and deep rather than broad. • Classroom learning should be linked to students' experiences, interests, and values. • Instruction should not be piecemeal but should integrate concepts, perhaps across disciplines. • The curriculum should be guided by a broad conceptual framework rather than a scope and sequence of specific skills.	*Inferences about Curriculum and Instruction* • The curriculum should be meaningful to students, reflecting the values, symbols, and ways of knowing of the communities from which students come, while introducing students to new cultures and cultural ways of thinking. • Instruction should include opportunities for students to examine and discuss multiple perspectives and engage in different approaches to learning and demonstrating knowledge.

High Standards of Performance for All Students

To further illustrate the need to incorporate a sociocultural perspective into the school improvement equation, let us look to the program of research on whole school reform directed by Kate Jamentz at WestEd, a Regional Educational Laboratory based in San Francisco. This program centers on helping schools and districts establish standards for student performance, develop systems to measure achievement of those standards, and build the capacity and organizational culture to sustain standards-based reform. As part of the process of building school communities in which agreed-upon standards for high-quality student work guide instructional planning, professional development, accountability, community engagement, and so forth, Jamentz has developed a frame for helping schools understand what they need to look like when they organize around this commitment (see Table 2.3).

According to Jamentz (1998), when high standards are in place, performance expectations are clear and students produce high-quality work that demonstrates an awareness of what they need to do and why they need to do it. When students are managers of their own learning, revision and rehearsal become natural behaviors for them because they view their teachers as approachable advocates who guide them toward commonly understood goals. For this to happen, Jamentz asserts, teachers must be in a position to provide learning opportunities for their students as they assume a more collaborative stance. Working from such a collaborative framework gives teachers formative ways to learn about students and helps them recognize the steps to take when children are moving too slowly or too quickly through material. Using community-wide agreements about quality work, teachers plan instructional activities that guide students to achieve the standards. In other words, as Jamentz writes, "'higher standards for all' is not just about teaching new material to more students or becoming a more demanding judge of performance" (p. 12).

This approach has implications for school organization and administrative support, as explained in Table 2.3. Still, if schools are truly to take into account the experiences and perspectives of diverse populations and thus be responsive to diverse students, more definition and refinement of these important elements is needed. Let us return to the requisite capabilities and practices outlined in Table 2.3 and note how WestEd's Language and Cultural Diversity Program has further delineated the skills, abilities, and knowledge that are crucial to building standards-based systems committed to high achievement for every child.

High Standards and Community-Based Knowledge

Jamentz's categories (see Table 2.4) are embellished with key questions that acknowledge community-based knowledge and understandings. These beginning questions are juxtaposed with five questions (in column one) that are at the heart of school improvement. Although educators must acquire specialized knowledge about diversity, this educational process must be done in ways that are realistic, appropriate, and adequate and that will not lead to stereotyping.

For example, how do we come to understand teachers' relationships to students without opening the door to personal likes and dislikes or teaching style preferences? Clearly a great deal of work is yet to be done if we expect to walk into very different classrooms around the nation and feel confident that truly high standards are in place for all students. The questions posed in Table 2.4 focus attention on the central issues and perspectives that should become part of every educator's knowledge base. If the answers to these questions begin to include the kinds of sociocultural understandings described, we will be far closer to the inclusivity we desire in our schools.

Conclusion

The real test of improvement efforts will be their success with diverse students. We cannot effect change without honoring the perspectives of teachers, parents, and others who live and work in the diverse cultural communities from which many of these students come.

As educators in the field face the critical opportunities and challenges of the new millennium, we must provide teachers with experiences that influence the ways in which they think about and respond to cultural differences in the classroom. Teachers must examine their own cultural assumptions and deepen their understanding of and respect for ideas, practices, and perspectives that differ from their own. They must gain experience interacting and working with people from a variety of cultural backgrounds and in a variety of cross-cultural settings. In addition, they must develop the ethnographic and analytic skills needed to acquire the cultural knowledge and understandings necessary to build a bridge of communication between themselves and their students. We must demand that teachers learn to create classroom communities that grant voice and legitimacy to the perspectives and experiences of those who are different from themselves — communities that will not require students to surrender personal and cultural identity in exchange for high academic achievement.

Discussion Questions

1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?

2. What evidence will we use to establish that students know it, and what data can we use to guide our improvement efforts?

3. What opportunities to learn do all students need to ensure that they achieve identified standards?

4. What professional and community capacity and system supports are necessary to ensure that all students achieve?

5. How does the system align its policies and resources to ensure achievement for all students?

Table 2.3
Evidence of High Standards

Requisite Student Behaviors	Requisite Teacher Capabilities	Requisite Administrative Support	Requisite Organizational Practices
• Be actively engaged in producing high-quality work • Be able to describe what is expected of them and why they are doing it • Demonstrate the *habits* of rehearsal and revision • Discuss work-in-progress in terms of quality • Be better able to describe what assistance they need • See their teachers as advocates and coaches	• Understand the community's expectations for student performance • Design and conduct instructional activities aligned to standards • Analyze (and not simply score) student work • Make fair and credible judgments of quality • Systematically manage data and plan instruction accordingly • Communicate specific expectations to students • Teach students to evaluate their own work • Be relentless in the pursuit of improved performance • Make feedback a norm of professional practice	• Facilitate community-wide input on standards • Negotiate agreements and build ownership of standards and standards-based practice • Design and maintain supervision and accountability systems focused on standards • Invest in assessments that provide credible and useful data to decision makers at all levels • Focus professional development resources on standards • Develop and maintain systems to track resource allocations • Be guardians of coherence	• Articulate a collective and clear purpose defined by standards for all students • Conduct inclusive, ongoing dialogues about standards • Maintain the *habit* of rigorous inquiry and analysis of data • Provide time for and maintain norms of collaboration • Be responsive and flexible in allocating resources to identified needs • Maintain the habit of adjusting practice in the interest of greater quality and coherence

Table 2.4
Improving Schooling for Every Child: Questions to Consider

	Evidence of High Standards: *What messages are students given about their ability to meet high standards?*	Requisite Teacher Capabilities: *How do teachers use knowledge about language, culture, and diversity to increase student achievement?*	Requisite Organizational Practices: *How does the organization build on the community's knowledge and resources?*	Requisite Administrative Support: *In what ways does the administration support long-term growth for the staff, students, and the community it serves?*
1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?	• Are students comfortable taking risks to learn, trusting their own abilities, persevering when learning is challenging or difficult? • Are students taught mechanisms for participating successfully in the culture of school? • How do students know that their home culture is valued as a source of learning in the classroom? • How do students know that their culture and language are respected in school? • How do students know that their family is respected in the school?	• What knowledge base about language and culture do teachers use to support their students' learning? • How do teachers use constructivist and socio-cultural theories of learning to inform their teaching? • How do teachers build on community-based knowledge when developing curriculum, instruction, and assessment? • How do teachers forge partnerships with parents and communities in ways that are congruent with students' language and culture? • How do teachers view diversity as a strength?	• What organization practices build on community-based knowledge? • How is the intellectual base within the school community incorporated into curriculum, instruction, and assessment?	• How do standards reflect community values or allow for inclusion of a community knowledge base and standards? • How have all segments of the community had input into standards?

Table 2.4 (continued)
Improving Schooling for Every Child: Questions to Consider

	Evidence of High Standards: *What messages are students given about their ability to meet high standards?*	Requisite Teacher Capabilities: *How do teachers use knowledge about language, culture, and diversity to increase student achievement?*	Requisite Organizational Practices: *How does the organization build on the community's knowledge and resources?*	Requisite Administrative Support: *In what ways does the administration support long-term growth for the staff, students, and the community it serves?*
2. What evidence will we use to establish that they know it and what data can we use to guide our improvement efforts?	• Do students know the audience and purpose of assessments given to them?	• How do sources of evidence and methods for gathering evidence reflect consideration for the ways in which students know and demonstrate their learning?	• How are the community's ways of knowing and assessing knowledge incorporated into standards-based education? • How do the organizations draw on the resources of students and staff to examine and interpret data?	• In what ways does the administration monitor assessment practices for bias? • How does the administration communicate assessment information to the community?
3. What opportunities to learn do students need to ensure that each student achieves identified standards?	• How often are students given opportunities to learn high-level material? • If the culture of the school differs from that of the community, are students taught explicitly about the linguistic, cultural, and intellectual underpinnings of the target learning? • Do students know that they can retain their cultural identity and excel in the classroom and school?	• Have teachers examined their preconceptions about students' capacities to excel in all subjects?	• Are courses structured so that all students have opportunities to learn high-level content?	• How does the administration monitor teaching, learning, and assessment to ensure that all students have the opportunity to learn high-level content?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.4 (continued)
Improving Schooling for Every Child: Questions to Consider

	Evidence of High Standards: *What messages are students given about their ability to meet high standards?*	Requisite Teacher Capabilities: *How do teachers use knowledge about language, culture, and diversity to increase student achievement?*	Requisite Organizational Practices: *How does the organization build on the community's knowledge and resources?*	Requisite Administrative Support: *In what ways does the administration support long-term growth for the staff, students, and the community it serves?*
4. What professional and community capacities and systems supports are necessary to ensure that all students achieve?		• How do teachers use the resources of the community as a source of learning in the classroom?	• How are participation structures in schools and school systems inclusive? How are they structured in ways that include all members of the community? • How is the community represented in the personnel of the school? • How does the teaching staff reflect the language, culture, ethnicity, or race of the student body? • Are members of the community viewed as peers?	• How does the administration support a culture of learning for teachers, students, and parents?
5. How does the system align its policies and resources to ensure that all students achieve the standards?		• How do teachers make use of the students' primary language to develop cognitive abilities and performances while supporting the development of the second language?	• How are resources allocated in ways that ensure equitable outcomes, e.g., when new assessments are being developed, are English language learners' needs addressed from the beginning of the development process or as an afterthought?	• How does the administration ensure equity and access for all students?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Ascher, M. (1991). *Ethnomathematics*. New York: Chapman & Hall.

Au, K. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11*, 91-15.

Au, K., & Kawakami, A. (1994). Cultural congruence in instruction. In E. Hollins, J. King, & W. Hayman (Eds.). *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 5-23). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bartolome, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64*(2), 173-194.

Brown, J., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 1*(1), 32-42.

Cobb, P. (1994). Where is the mind? Constructivist and sociocultural perspectives on mathematical development. *Educational Researcher, 23*(7), 13-20.

D'Ambrosio, U. (1987). *Reflections on ethnomathematics. International Study Group on Ethnomathematics Newsletter, 3*(1), 3-5.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children*. New York: The New Press.

Dumont, R., Jr. (1972). Learning English and how to be silent: Studies in Sioux and Cherokee classrooms. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 34-369). New York: Teachers College Press.

Eisenhart, M., Finkel, E., & Marion, S. (1996, Summer). Creating the conditions for scientific literacy: A re-examination. *American Educational Research Journal, 33*(2), 261-295.

Eriks-Brophy, A., & Crago, M. (1993). *Transforming classroom discourse: Forms of evaluation in Inuit IR and IRe routines*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Foster, M. (1998). *Black teachers on teaching*. New York: The New Press.

Frankenstein, M., & Powell, A. (1994). Toward liberatory mathematics: Paulo Freire's epistemology and ethnomathematics. In P. McLaren & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *The politics of liberation: Paths from Freire* (pp. 74-99). London: Routledge.

Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Jamentz, K. (1998). *Standards: From document to dialogue*. San Francisco: WestEd.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lipka, J. (1991). Toward a culturally based pedagogy: A case study of one Yup'ik Eskimo teacher. *Anthropology in Education Quarterly*, 22(3), 203-223.

Lipka, J. (1994). Culturally negotiated schooling: Toward a Yup'ik mathematics. *Journal of American Indian Education, 33*(3), 14-30.

Lipka, J. (Ed.). (1998). *Transforming the culture of schools: Yup'ik Eskimo examples*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

McAlpine, L., & Taylor, D. (1993, Fall). Instructional preferences of Cree, Inuit, and Mohawk teachers. *Journal of American Indian Education, 33*(1), 1-20.

Mitchell, R. (1994, Fall). Focusing on learning: Change driven by standards. *CAIP Quarterly, 7*(1), 1, 11.

Mohatt, G., & Erickson, F. (1981). Cultural differences in teaching styles in an Odawa school: A sociolinguistic approach. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom* (pp. 105-119). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Nelson-Barber, S. (1985). Prosodic patterning in Pima English: Relevance for interethnic miscommunication. (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 46*, 08A. (UMI 8523338)

Nelson-Barber, S., & Trumbull, E. (1995). *Culturally responsive mathematics and science teaching for Native students*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Nelson-Barber, S., & Trumbull, E. (in press). Tapping indigenous knowledge in instruction: Case examples in science and mathematics pedagogy. *Micronesian Educator*.

Olson, L., Chang, H., De La Rosa Salazar, D., Leong, C., Perez, Z., McClain, G., & Raffel, L. (1994). *The unfinished journey: Restructuring schools in a diverse society*. California Tomorrow, San Francisco: The Education for a Diverse Society Project.

Philips, S. (1983). *The invisible culture*. New York: Longman.

Secada, W. (1992). Race, ethnicity, social class, language, and achievement in mathematics. In D. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on math teaching and learning* (pp. 623-660). New York: Macmillan.

Swisher, K., & Deyhle, D. (1987). Styles of learning and learning of styles: Educational conflicts for American Indian/Alaskan native youth. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 8*(4), 345-360.

Swisher, K., & Deyhle, D. (1992). Adapting instruction to culture. In J. Rehyner (Ed.), *Teaching American Indian students* (pp. 81-95). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Trumbull, E., Nelson-Barber; S., & Mitchell, J. (in press). Enhancing mathematics instruction for indigenous American students. In W. G. Secada (Series Ed.) & J. Hankes (Vol. Ed.), *Changing the faces of mathematics: Vol. 5. Perspectives on American Indians*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

CHAPTER THREE

SCHOOL REFORM AND ALIGNMENT OF STANDARDS

by

Margarita Calderón, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Past systemic reform efforts failed to raise student achievement or narrow achievement gaps between minority and non-minority students, in part because they neglected the needs of growing numbers of language minority (LM) students. Thus, this paper discusses three key issues concerning the instruction of LM students: (1) existing barriers to quality instruction, including factors that affect LM students' academic success; (2) effective instructional programs for LM students; and (3) staff development that promotes effective instruction for LM students.

Dr. Margarita Calderón is a nationally recognized leader in the area of Bilingual Education and a research scientist for the Johns Hopkins University's Center for Research on Education for Students Place at Risk. She is conducting longitudinal research studies in schools in the E1 Paso, Texas area on effective bilingual education programs, schooling success for language minority students, and on building teachers' learning communi-ties. Dr. Calderón is director of the International Academies for Cooperative Learning. She also conducts institutes for teachers and administrators on cooperative learning and whole school implementation of change.

INTRODUCTION

School reform movements of the past 20 years have had little impact on teaching and learning. Overall, students are doing as well as, but no better than, students in 1971, the year of the first National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). However, there is a noticeable gap between minority and non-minority students, especially language minority (LM) students. For example, the 1994 NAEP report indicates that although 29 percent of White fourth graders scored below the basic level in reading, about 64 percent of Latino students scored this poorly (Slavin & Fashola 1998). Why hasn't school reform closed such achievement gaps?

Over the past two decades, educators also have experienced a constant bombardment of standards, benchmarks, milestones, and indicators — all targeting improved change achievement. Why haven't standards closed achievement gaps?

To improve achievement for aii students, particularly LM students, the quality and appropriateness of instruction must be profoundly changed. It appears, however, that neither

systemic reforms nor state standards and assessments are having much impact on instruction (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996; Joyce, et al., 1993; Lieberman & Miller, 1990). Although state standards and assessments have influenced what is taught, rarely have they influenced how well it is taught (Goertz, Floden, & O'Day, 1996, Newman, King, & Rigdon, 1997; Slavin & Fashola, 1998). Until reforms take LM populations seriously, results from NAEP assessments and other indicators of achievement will remain the same.

This paper focuses on three issues related to quality instruction for language minority students: (1) barriers to quality instruction and school reform, (2) components of effective instructional programs for LM students, and (3) staff development that promotes effective instruction for LM students.

Barriers to Quality Instruction

As the number of language minority students continues to escalate in virtually every school in the United States, an unprecedented effort must be made to prepare teachers and administrators to better serve them. Research on effective practices for meeting the needs of LM students is available to schools and universities (Fashola, et al., 1996; Calderón, 1996). However, there is lack of willingness to accept and implement these practices. There is one of the key barriers to quality instruction for LM students. Other barriers discussed in the following pages include teachers' lack of knowledge about cultures, the mismatch between students' cultures and the traditional norms and expectations of schools, tracking practices, limited use or misuse of a variety of instructional techniques, and mismatches between teachers' cultures and students' cultures that lead to misconceptions about key factors that shape the school experiences of immigrant students.

What Worked in the Past Does Not Work Now

The intention of school reform is to ensure quality education for all, but the diversity in culture, religion, language, and academic background of students in most classrooms today challenges every educator's preparation. Place of origin, socioeconomic status, religious and education background all play a major role in the student's social, academic, and affective resources and talents, which may or may not match the traditional norms and expectations of most schools. Thus, as schools set out to "reform," "restructure," "transform," or update their schooling practices, they must consider looking at LM students in a completely new way: The success of LM students must be considered as important as the success of students from the majority population. Schools must focus on the success of LM students, a focus that should be reflected in the school's vision, mission, and delivery.

Schools Have Traditionally Served as Sorting Mechanisms

Students whose personal backgrounds fit the dominant mold are often labeled "successful," while others are shunted into lower tracks, lower-quality schools, ineffective remedial programs, special education, or vocational programs (Slavin & Boykin, 1996). Personal background should not determine the school program that a student is directed toward. A11 children, regardless of background, need to experience a demanding curriculum and be held to high expectations. The Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR) calls this a "talent development" model (Slavin & Boykin, 1996). This model, developed and currently the focus of study by CRESPAR researchers, emphasizes the elimination of ability grouping, remediation, and most special education pull-out programs in favor of providing curricula, instructional methods, educational environments, and assistance that enable all students to learn rich, difficult content.

Curricula and Instructional Methods Do Not Address the Needs of Language Minority Students

Schools that move away from the sorting paradigm must transform school norms and structures to respect the personal, cultural, and linguistic assets of all children. They also must learn to use curricula and instructional methods that make success available to diverse learners. Instructional approaches that engage the full range of human talents are those that are constructivist, active, and cooperative.

The misuse of such approaches, however, can interfere with LM students' learning. For example, cooperative learning is sometimes interpreted as a set of "games" that students get to play when they are bored. Other times, students may be busily "doing" an activity in teams; however, upon closer examination, not much learning is taking place. These superficial implementations and misinterpretations of cooperative learning often stem from workshops on the technique that are offered once a year without on-site follow-up support to teachers.

Cultural Differences

It is estimated that by the turn of the century up to 40 percent of the children in the nation's classrooms will be non-White and that the majority will be Latino. Since the nation's teaching force is primarily White and becoming more so, we can anticipate major cultural clashes in many schools unless we abandon preconceived notions and misconceptions about educating Latino students. Some of these misconceptions are highlighted in the following discussion about factors that shape immigrant students' school experiences.

Generalizations about immigrant students are inappropriate (Fashola, et al., 1996) because these students — like all students — are highly diverse. Even Latino immigrant students come from extremely diverse backgrounds in terms of country of origin, family history, educational level, and socioeconomic level. Although English proficiency is a problem for most

children of immigrants, many also confront a series of other "key factors" that shape their experiences in schools: their immigrant status, their gender, social challenges that negatively impact self-identity, whether the transition to adolescence has been smooth or rough, family support and expectations, their resilience, intergenerational conflict, economic resources, and schooling mismatches (Gonzalez & Darling Hammond, 1996; Lucas, 1993 & 1996; Walqui, 1996).

Educational Background, Resiliency, and Knowing the Culture of Opportunity

Contrary to the common view that all immigrant students have achieved little educational success, are underachieving, and have limited English skills, we find an ever-growing population of sons and daughters of immigrant parents who are excelling or could excel if given the opportunity in schools. As Gonzalez (1993) points out in "School Meanings and Their Cultural Bias," biases in schools are not always visible; they often occur below the surface of day-to-day school operations and result in false assumptions about students. From the CRESPAR studies, we have found that "opportunities for academic success" are factors that are critical to all students (LaPoint, Jordan, McPartland, & Towns, 1996). In applying this concept to immigrant students, my own studies indicate that this means not simply providing opportunities for success, but also helping students and their parents "know the culture of opportunity" (Calderón, 1996b). For students and parents of other cultures, unless opportunities are pointed out, they remain reserved for the privileged few.

Immigrant students cannot simply be defined by inadequacies and deficiencies; we must consider that these students have complex issues and coherent lives. In spite of their low status, racism, poverty, and marginalization, there can be adaptive integrity, for example in the processes of resiliency (Slavin & Boykin, 1996). Resiliency, which refers to how the individual responds to risk, can be conceptualized in three ways: (1) overcoming the odds, (2) remaining competent in the presence of acute or chronic life stressors, or (3) recovering from trauma. The resiliency and cultural integrity of immigrant students are related in that both address mechanisms that underlie cognitive functioning, sense of competence, personal values, and orientations.

Student resiliency can be channeled toward higher education aspirations. If an immigrant couple never attended high school, it is very difficult for them to help their children map out a four-year path that will lead to success. In addition to lack of personal experience, parents may believe that it is not their place to interfere with decisions about which courses their children should take. In a Mexican culture, for example, parents believe that teachers are the professionals who take care of such things. The culture of the new school, new customs, assumptions, and different expectations alienate immigrant parents and students. Their way of knowing about school does not fit the new context.

Immigrant Status and Self Concept

Assigned roles within the family vary greatly among cultures. Lines of authority and expectations related to birth order, sex roles, and division of labor are powerful agents in

molding children's social relationships (Ovando & Collier, 1998). Negative perceptions of a student's sociocultural and political status can affect his or her life. The way a language minority student is perceived by the mainstream culture also can affect the student's academic performance (Ogbu, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins, 1988).

Many immigrants to the United States find themselves categorized and treated differently from other students. The degree of negative treatment most certainly impacts the student's self-confidence and self-worth. Without a sense of belonging, the student can either withdraw or become part of a group that accepts him or her. In some cases, these groups are gangs.

Gender Issues and Other Intergenerational Conflicts

It is not uncommon for families from some cultures to expect their daughters to prioritize family needs above school commitments. Parents' expectations for their daughters and sons also vary extensively from culture to culture and from family to family. These expectations can create ambivalent expectations in the children themselves and can even cause serious family conflicts. Sometimes these conflicts are related to cultural clashes or problems adapting to a new culture. Some students have learned how to assimilate into the new culture much more readily than their parents have. In addition, communication gaps are common when the school convinces the student that the way to succeed is to speak only English. And, sometimes parents reinforce their child's use of English only in the hope that it will help the child be successful.

As students steer away from their native language, their values and self-identity also are often left behind. New ways of dressing, new moral codes, and new behaviors widen the intergenerational gap. Ovando and Collier (1998) find that as Mexican immigrant youngsters start wearing Nike shoes and listening to rap music, they are acculturating to outward aspects of contemporary U.S. culture. Although these children may adopt some U.S. clothing styles and music tastes, such things as their language, gestures, facial expressions, value systems, and social interaction styles most likely will remain Mexican for a longer period of time. This transition period can be very confusing to the adolescent.

Information about students and their parents is a valuable tool educators can use to help LM students make it through their personal hurdles. Unfortunately, students may resent their parents coming to school for fear of being ridiculed by their peers. This embarrassment over parents also creates a greater distance between the school and the parents.

Social Challenges and Self Concept

The immigrant needs to make comprehensible a whole new culture and language and to create a new self concept that embraces both the old and the new. This process of acculturation involves painful, sometimes unconscious decisions, such as what to save or sacrifice from the old, what to adopt from the new, and how to integrate these into a comfortable sense of self (Olsen, 1988, p. 30). The process is further complicated for adolescent immigrant students because they must face the transition from childhood to adolescence at the same time they are establishing an identity in the new culture.

Culture, language, relationships, and identity are interwoven. School experiences, relationships, and social interactions shape identity. Learning is situated in social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978). This means that individual learning is mediated by interactions with peers or teachers who are more skilled in the use of the culture's tools. Positive social interaction at school is therefore vital. Such interactions may be difficult, however, if as Cummins (1993) argues, schools disempower ethnic and racial minorities through racist structures, sending the message that "to survive in this society your identity must be eradicated and your community must not threaten the power and privilege of the dominant group" (p. 56).

Some students experience more difficulties than others in establishing a new cultural identity because they have unhealed emotional scars. They might have experienced traumatic, violent, or dehumanizing experiences in their native country or on their journey to this country. Further, perhaps a student experienced prejudice and discrimination upon arrival. When it is difficult to know the student's background, it might be important for teachers to seek help from the school psychologist, a social worker, or a religious leader.

Learning to create a balance between two cultures (the home culture and the dominant American culture) is a major challenge for students during this delicate period of transition. If the home culture is relinquished for the new, dire consequences are likely. When the home language and culture become a part of the student's repertoire of talents, a more positive outcome is possible.

Economic Hurdles and Physical/Motivational Stamina

Most adolescent immigrant students have undergone recent economic changes and are in the process of making adjustments to their new status. In some cases, they left a comfortable well-to-do socioeconomic status to come to this country and are having to do without some of the previous comforts or luxuries. In other cases, the family arrived with barely enough to subsist on and expected the older children to find part-time jobs as quickly as possible. Sons and daughters of migrant workers, more likely than not, are expected to work in the fields on weekends, after school, and during summer vacation.

All of this takes a toll on the motivation and physical stamina of youth. Although it is impossible to ask schools to remedy these situations, educators should try to learn about the types of struggles and economic concerns faced by the family unit. This awareness better equips teachers to help students cope with their circumstances. Without coping mechanisms, many students in such situations ultimately replicate their parents' paths of poverty and school failure by dropping out of high school (Trueba, 1987).

Schooling Mismatches

Immigrant students typically receive assistance learning English through English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, but other needs and as well as students' unique contributions are generally ignored by the education system (Gonzalez, 1993; Lucas, 1996). Immigrant adolescents come into a new culture with a myriad of experiences. Some come to schools with an education

that is far superior to that of U.S. students; others attended school for only two or three years. U.S. schools typically do not have programs that address these two extremes. As a result, all immigrant students, regardless of educational background, typically are placed in the same ESL course or in the one "sheltered math" or "sheltered social studies" class. Highly educated LM students quickly become bored in such classes, while under-schooled students become frustrated because they need additional assistance.

Within these "tracked classes," there might be other mismatches in prior experiences and expectations. For instance, a student might come from a country with a nationally standardized curriculum that is highly structured and primarily transmitted by an authoritarian teacher. If that student is placed in a classroom context in which cooperative learning, inquiry, and discovery are the teaching and learning norms, he or she is bound to be perplexed or shocked. The student may have been rewarded in the past for taking on a passive, silent role. He or she might interpret new norms of learning as opportunities for laissez-faire behavior or socializing instead of learning. Sensing this, a teacher can facilitate the student's transition into an active learning role in a new language in his or her classes.

ESL tracks in secondary schools may create other problems for immigrant students. Watered-down courses or tracking systems accelerate a downward spiral for many students that culminates in dropping out. Even for students who do not drop out, the typical immigrant track eliminates many options as well as the opportunity to take college-track courses. Many immigrant students do not know which college-bound courses to take, what steps to take in an environment that prepares the select few for college, or how to apply for admission and financial aid. Worse, students who plan to enter the world of work often receive outdated, ineffective vocational training that will do them little good in the job market.

The Teaching of English

English as a Second Language (ESL) classes have typically concentrated on teaching semesters of oral language development based on a few grammatical structures. Students have been held back from the reading and writing processes by well-intended teachers who think that students must have a speaking knowledge of English before they start reading or before they can be held accountable for higher-order information processing tasks (Calderón & Cummins, 1982; Edelsky, Altwerger & Flores, 1990; Hudelson, 1994; Tinajero & Ada, 1993). Much of the research has shown that ESL skills are developed faster and at higher levels when listening, speaking, reading, and writing are integrated in a context of meaningful texts and interactive activities (Freeman & Freeman, 1994; Goodman & Wilde, 1992; McLaughlin & McLeod, 1997; Calderón, Hertz-Lazarowitz & Slavin, 1997).

ESL teachers have attempted, with little success, to bring students' language skills up to par with those of native English speakers, without any collaboration from their colleagues. There is an abyss between what students experience in their ESL classes and what they encounter in content classes during the remainder of the day. Without native language instruction at the secondary level, students usually find themselves in watered-down, "remedial" English courses.

This practice impedes their educational progress and does not allow them to prepare adequately for university enrollment (Lucas, 1993).

Successful Comprehensive Programs for Language Minority Students

In the 1970s, the United States Commission on Civil Rights produced a series of studies on the education of Mexican American youth. These studies documented the following:

- Mexican American public school pupils . . . are severely isolated by school districts and by schools within individual districts. (1971a, p. 59)

- Mexican Americans . . . do not obtain the benefits of public education at a rate equal to that of their Anglo classmates. . . . Their reading is poorer; their repetition of grades is more frequent; their overageness is more prevalent; and they participate in extracurricular activities to a lesser degree than their Anglo counterparts. (1971b, p. 41)

- Schools use a variety of exclusionary practices which deny the student the use of his language, a pride in his heritage, and the support of his community. (1972a, p. 48)

- The schools . . . are failing to involve Mexican American children as active participants in the classroom to the same extent as Anglo children. On most of the measures of verbal interaction between teacher and student, there are gross disparities in favor of Anglos.... They use or build upon the contributions of Anglo pupils fully 40 percent more frequently than those of Chicano pupils. (1973, p. 43)

- The six reports . . . cite scores of instances in which the actions of individual school officials have reflected an attitude which blames educational failure on Chicano children rather than on the inadequacies of the school. (1974, p. 69)

Although these reports were written over 20 years ago, schools have made few changes because of the pervasive view educators have of Latino and LM students in general. Other studies reveal a history of neglect of immigrant or ethnic minority students (Trueba, 1987; California State Department of Education, 1986; McDonnell & Hill, 1993; Long, et al., 1984; Diaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986). Schools continue to blame the students or their parents, rather than the norms and culture of teaching and learning at the school.

Components of an Elementary School Comprehensive Multifaceted Program

Fortunately, some schools are actively engaged in finding ways to educate immigrant students and foster high academic achievement that is on a par with all students. These schools

have made a major shift from remedial education to maintaining high standards for all students. First, they recognize that immigrant students do not start on an equal playing field with their English-speaking students — for one thing, these immigrants must learn math, science, social studies, and the other core subjects at the same time that they are learning English. Second, by analyzing their programs and conducting in-depth teacher self-analyses, staff and administrators identify barriers and obstacles to student success. After further study and discussion, they implement comprehensive, multifaceted language and content development programs with parallel family support programs. This process involves setting standards for themselves as educators of LM students. It also involves an ongoing program of study and reflection.

The program components described below are characteristic of elementary schools that have successfully implemented reform that focuses on comprehensive programs and research-based approaches that ensure that all children succeed in a demanding, high-expectations curriculum. This "talent development" model (see Slavin & Boykin, 1996) is used in conjunction with established academic standards and benchmarks.

- **Literacy development**. In pre-kindergarten and kindergarten, the focus is on oral language development, using thematic units and learning centers. The early stages of literacy are developed through interactive reading, shared reading, and story-telling and retelling. Phonemic awareness is developed through the use of a variety of children's books and curriculum supplements. Children develop familiarity with letter identification, letter-sound associations, and concepts of print. They use invented spelling to further their knowledge of the sounds of the alphabet and conventional spelling. All of these skills are taught in both English and the primary language in two-way bilingual programs or in the primary language first in a transitional bilingual program.

  First-grade instruction continues to emphasize language skills, auditory discrimination, and sound blending. Sound-symbol relationships are taught at this level in order to prevent remedial instruction in later grades. Students are encouraged to value reading and writing for enjoyment as well as to send and receive ideas. Comprehension strategies, such as summarizing main ideas, drawing inferences, and checking whether ideas make sense, are taught along with decoding.

  In second through fifth grades, the focus is on enhancing comprehension and the ability to analyze, critique, abstract, and reflect on text. After rich discussions and interpretations of the author's craft from a variety of texts, students practice the mechanics of writing, spelling, and conventions of print as they convey their ideas. Students learn to express their ideas through different types of composition techniques. They read extensively.

- **Tutoring**. One-to-one tutoring is provided by certified teacher tutors in both languages, in daily 20-minute blocks for students who need early intensive intervention.

- **Student grouping**. Students are grouped heterogeneously for homeroom and most of the school day, but regrouped during 90-minute reading periods at homogeneous reading levels across grades one through three. Cooperative learning strategies are integrated into the literacy activities to further develop bilingual abilities. Tutors, librarians, or other certified personnel also become reading teachers during this time to reduce the student-teacher ratio.

- **Regular assessments**. All students are assessed every eight weeks in order to create new reading groups and make new tutorial placements.

- **Support for teachers**. One full-time facilitator for English and one full-time facilitator for the primary language are assigned to work with teachers to implement and monitor their use of the program. Grade-level teacher teams meet every two weeks or more to problem solve and support one another. Staff development is provided prior to and during the program through a minimum of 24 person days. Each grade level receives targeted, specific inservice on the teachers' needs for that grade level.

- **Support for families**. A family support team is established to help support parents ensure the success of their children. The team focuses on attendance, coordination of outside social services, parent involvement, and student behavior.

- **School structures that support the program**. Schools commit to reducing special education referrals and student retention. They also make scheduling adjustments to accommodate grouping and tutoring activities, and allocate resources to their libraries to support the reading curriculum. In addition, they establish a Building Advisory Committee to help shape program policy and guide program development.

- **Integrated curriculum**. The math and science program adds an integrated science, social studies, writing, and mathematics curriculum that provides daily opportunities for children to work together to solve simulated and real-life problems using the knowledge they have learned in class. These subjects are taught by qualified teachers in the primary language using materials that equal or exceed the quality of materials used in classes taught in English.

Components of a Secondary
Comprehensive Multifaceted Program

Programs in middle schools and high schools with large Latino populations face the greatest challenges in restructuring for LM students' success. Nevertheless, there are already documented approaches that are helping students and their teachers. Some of these approaches are listed below.

- **Integration of ESL methods**. Research-based methods for teaching and learning ESL are integrated into all subject areas. Constructivist models of Inquiry, Concept Attainment, Group Investigation, and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) are integrated with ESL or Content English techniques and are used across the curriculum. Students participate in cooperative learning through methods such as CIRC or in a variety of cooperative techniques and activities where their individual talents can be shared and further developed. The thematic units for cooperative learning are developed around inquiry and discovery questions.

- **Native language instruction**. Course work can be offered in the students' primary language. Other students interested in becoming bi-literate also take these courses.

- **Demanding curriculum**. The core curriculum is demanding for all students and actively involves them in learning. The curriculum focuses on higher order competencies and requires students to demonstrate their grasp of knowledge and skills. Integrating technologies to meet instructional goals is also part of the curriculum.

- **Emphasis on culture**. The curriculum is based on students' culture, thereby empowering students. Instruction is attentive to cultural patterns and norms, promoting cultural literacy and helping students connect to and interpret cultural traditions. Grade-level teachers collaborate on the development and teaching of interdisciplinary thematic units by incorporating information about students' families with local history. For instance, they use authentic literature and history books from the students' culture to study American history and world history. They use the mythological figure of "La Llorona" or books such as Gary Paulson's *Canyons and The Crossing*, which help students view local issues and historical events from Anglo, Native American, Chicano, and Mexican perspectives.

  Southwest themes, such as "chili," are used for interdisciplinary units. In science class, students study scientific processes through experiments or laboratory analyses of different varieties of chili. Their math class consists of measuring, sorting, and categorizing chilis; taking school and community polls on chili preferences; charting preferences; finding recipes; and creating new

recipes. The social studies class learns world history and geography by tracing the origins of chili and chili's use today. Southwest literature, pamphlets, and advertisements become the texts in the ESL/language arts class. Colorful posters, ceramics, and displays are created in the art class. The unit ends with a "chili cook-off" put on by parents and students from all subject-matter classes.

- **Communal organization of school**. Classroom organization in learning communities (cooperative teams) replaces tracking with approaches that make student diversity in the classroom an asset rather than an impediment to learning and motivation. Immigrant students start out with teams of teachers (language arts/reading, math, science, social studies, and electives) in smaller organizational units within the school using longer blocks of time. These 90-minute blocks facilitate the use of learner-centered activities and cooperative learning. In addition, having only four periods a day allows students to focus on four subjects, which facilitates accelerated learning of language and content. The team organization and block schedule help teachers know and understand their students much better.

- **Detracking of instruction**. During the second year, immigrant students are integrated with majority students. Classrooms are organized into cooperative learning communities to make student diversity an asset rather than an impediment to learning and motivation.

- **Culture of opportunity**. A culture of opportunity is established through a variety of approaches. For example, students and families are informed continually about college prep courses and other preparation workshops. They also have opportunities to learn about the purpose of the PSAT and SAT exams, schedules for such entrance exams, university admissions policies and procedures, the value of grade point averages, and the value of extracurricular activities.

- **Technology as an instructional tool**. Technology is an integral part of all subject areas, not an isolated laboratory. Students learn by using the Internet to communicate with students from other cultures.

- **Growth-oriented assessment**. The model for accountability and evaluation that teachers use in the classroom combines ratings of both language development and content so that the progress of immigrant students can be effectively measured.

- **Integration of language and culture**. Students' primary language and culture permeate their school and extracurricular activities. The school newspaper, Mariachi band, choir, folkloric dance groups, and sports all reflect the Latino culture and language.

- **Family affirmation**. Traditionally, there is a loose connection between home and school. In successful schools, there are new forms of partnerships with parents and community members to coordinate learning activities and reinforcing learning in each setting. The connections are culturally relevant and interesting to the parents.

- **The principal as program proponent**. The principal's role is a balance of "nurturing and nagging" while promoting diversity and bilingualism. The principal attends all professional development sessions on instructional methods and research on language minority schooling and reaches out to all parents and effectively brings the community into the school.

- **Professional development**. All teachers in the school participate in year round professional development training. They also participate in Teacher Learning Community (TLC) study groups, curriculum development, peer coaching, teacher ethnographies, action research, the development of their own teaching portfolios, and the training of new teachers and teachers in other schools. By assisting other teachers, they learn more about their own practices.

Appropriate alternative appraisal systems support these reform strategies. Teachers jointly construct their self-appraisal plans with their supervisors, indicating the type of research, appropriate training-of-trainer program, peer coaching, or other activities they would like to focus on for the year.

Components of a Two Way Bilingual Comprehensive Multifaceted Program

The two-way bilingual program in the El Paso Independent School District in Texas is an example of a comprehensive, multifaceted school reform program. This two-way bilingual program is considered an enrichment program, unlike many bilingual programs, which are thought of as "remedial." There is quality and equality in all aspects of the El Paso program. Some of the key components of the two-way program are described below.

- **Bilingual instructional delivery**. One example of the quality of the two-way program is the instructional delivery. A monolingual and a bilingual teacher jointly deliver instruction through Success for All/Exito Para Todos and other models of teaching such as Group Investigation, Inquiry, and Discovery. Equal time is given to both languages through well-planned units of instruction. All content areas are taught in both languages, but no translation takes place. Students learn to immerse themselves in one language at a time. They work and learn in heterogeneous teams of Spanish- and English-speaking students throughout each day.

- **Thematic curriculum units**. To further support the importance of both languages, culture and history are taught through two perspectives. The thematic units incorporate literature books and texts from the United States as well as from Mexico to help students learn about the varying perspectives of different cultures.

- **Alternative assessments**. A variety of alternative assessment processes are used to observe and analyze student learning, instructional delivery, and curriculum. Alternative grading and report card systems are constantly adjusted.

- **Comprehensive professional development**. A comprehensive professional development program is conducted in both languages throughout the year to support teachers' acquisition of necessary skills and knowledge. In addition, teachers have opportunities to learn and work together through Teachers' Learning Communities sessions that are conducted at individual grade levels, at the school, and at the district level. The sessions are used to find solutions to problems, share methods and materials, and give feedback to program developers.

- **School structures that support the program**. All school structures are realigned to support the success of the program. For example, team teachers move into one classroom together and use the other for student learning centers. Walls are sometimes removed to create more space. Schedules are redesigned. Team teachers determine the schedule except for 90 minutes of daily reading, writing, and language instruction, which is taught in Spanish one week and in English the next.

- **New appraisal system**. Even the teacher appraisal system supports the program. Traditional appraisal systems are waived and teachers create new options for their self-appraisal and professional growth.

Staff Development To Support Quality Instruction For LM Students

In 1994, the National Coalition of Advocates for Students (NCAS) suggested that schools need a new type of teacher who

- has a repertoire of approaches that uphold high expectations of all students while affirming differences among students;

- is knowledgeable about issues of acculturation and second language acquisition;

- teaches with multicultural materials that reflect a diversity of experiences and perspectives;
- establishes the classroom as a safe place to explore issues of difference and prejudice;
- has the capacity to work together across differences of race and ethnicity;
- works well with individuals and groups from a variety of cultural backgrounds and communities;
- develops a greater understanding of all kinds of difference; and
- teaches his/her students to appreciate diversity. (pp. 126-128)

The complex instruction described by the NCAS requires that teachers combine a profound knowledge of subject matter with a wide repertoire of strategies and knowledge including teaching strategies, state-of-the-art knowledge about learning theory, cognition, pedagogy, curriculum, technology, and assessment, and ample knowledge of students' language, sociocultural, and developmental backgrounds. In addition, they should be as proficient as possible in two languages. Bilingual and mainstream teachers, counselors, resource specialists, and administrators must now undertake tasks they have never before been called upon to accomplish. Not surprisingly, there is much reluctance to change (Calderón, 1994a, 1994b, 1996a; Calderón & Carreon, 1994; DeVillar, Faltis & Cummins, 1994; Gonzalez Darling-Hammond, 1997). Unfortunately, the typical staff development program is not sufficient to overcome this reluctance or to provide the knowledge and skills teachers need.

Significant Research Findings

In our studies and in reviews of the literature, we have found that teachers are resistant to change only when staff development practices are inadequate and when administrators do not participate in learning (Calderón, 1994a, 1996b, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1993; Hord, 1997; Kleine-Kracht, 1993). When major changes occur and no support is provided, there is a tendency to blame students and/or parents, immigration policies, the low socioeconomic status of students, or students' unwillingness to learn English. These conditions are a sure sign of staff development neglect. They may be a reflection of "remedial" staff development where teachers have been deprived of the opportunity to act professionally. When teachers are denied the opportunity to intellectually examine the dilemmas that face them, they feel disempowered. As Hord (1997) writes, staff development programs, then, are critical for providing a framework for ongoing learning:

> To meet the needs of teachers, staff development programs must provide a context where . . . teachers and administrators continuously seek and share learning and act on their learning. The goal of their actions is to enhance their effectiveness as

professionals for the students' benefit; thus, this arrangement may also be termed communities of continuous inquiry and improvement. (p. 1)

Our work with Teachers Learning Communities (TLC) provides an example of such a framework for teachers' ongoing learning. The activities in a Teachers Learning Community provide the structures, intellectual tasks, and safe context that empower teachers and break their isolation and boundaries. These structures range from district wide networks to regional TLCs, to school wide or grade-level teams of teachers working together to study their craft. TLCs provide a range of collegial professional activities: profound study of new theories and pedagogy, observations of exemplary instruction, peer coaching opportunities, classroom action research, examination of curriculum, working with ethnographies, writing and sharing of autobiographies' learning through their own portfolios, analysis of student work, and analysis of their own teaching (Calderón, 1997).

Through TLCs, teachers, administrators, parents, or community representatives have the opportunity to learn, plan, problem solve, and create together. The activities and effectiveness of TLCs as a powerful staff development tool have been documented for the past eight years (Calderón, 1990-91, 1998). Cooperative learning in TLCs facilitates communication building, concept development, team building, self-reflection, self-esteem, and content mastery of the topics being studied. Conversations lead to shared understandings of district/school goals and new directions. This collaborative inquiry leads to quality relationships, critical professional analysis, and improvements in school practices.

Our current studies of TLCs have generated the following tools and processes that can be used by other schools as they pursue their own staff development reforms: (1) teachers' and principal's analyses of students' ethnographies of the culture of their classrooms, (2) teachers' analyses of their own teaching after examining and reflecting on ethnographies written by peer coaches, and (3) ways to construct collaborative meaning about teaching by participating in TLCs.

In addition to these tools and processes, study findings have given us insight into ways of bringing instruction, cultural relevancy, beliefs, and power relations to staff development programs. The program currently being developed is based on the assertion that every teacher has the capacity to succeed in education reforms and ongoing learning. The program builds on personal and cultural assets. Through our studies, we have identified the following staff development program characteristics that help teachers acquire knowledge, skills, and dispositions to improve the learning of LM students:

- **High expectations and an attractive, engaging program for the whole faculty**. A demanding curriculum aimed at active learning is critical. A common base of knowledge and application is provided for all teachers, since all will be involved in implementation changes. In addition, a multi-layered pedagogy is used to assist each individual discover his or her talents.

- **A learning community**. A TLC provides opportunities for further exploration of teachers' beliefs, mindsets, misconceptions, and the teaching-learning process in a collegial environment in which teachers feel comfortable taking risks. Reflective practice results only when schools set up TLC structures within the workday.

- **Relevance to classroom instruction and students' background**. Most "canned" inservice programs give teachers one-size-fits-all-students gimmicks. Instead, teachers must have opportunities to develop an ample repertoire of teaching models, techniques, and methods that encourage them to become cultural, linguistic, and knowledge mediators.

- **Profound knowledge of the students, their family, and their community**. Valuing students' communities and cultures is an ongoing process of learning for teachers as communities become more and more diverse. Ethnography and ethnographic techniques, such as narrative and life history technique (Apple, 1995-96; Arvizu, 1994) or Funds of Knowledge proposed by Moll (1992), are used to learn about students' backgrounds and develop the sensitivity that educators of immigrant students need.

- **Cultural empowerment**. The school is organized as a community to support stronger teacher-student bonds through the deliberate development of cultural knowledge and understanding, leading to its integration into all curricular and extracurricular activities. These bonds also help erase the "us and them" tradition of bilingual and mainstream teachers.

- **Bilingual empowerment**. Opportunities for teachers to become proficient in the students' target language(s) are part of the staff development program in bilingual schools. Most teachers benefit from refresher courses in Spanish or specific courses such as teaching math in Spanish.

- **Growth-oriented assessment**. Instead of being assessed by traditional appraisals conducted by administrators, teachers have options for measuring and demonstrating their own professional growth. Teachers write up self-assessment plans and choose a variety of meaningful approaches to reach their improvement goals. For example, teachers might use different levels of action research in their classrooms, profound study, peer coaching, portfolios, special courses, institutes, or residencies. Recognition for improvement also should be an integral part of any appraisal system.

- **Extra help when needed**. Peer assistance in the form of peer coaching, collaborative learning, additional workshops, the observations of other teachers, and expert coaching is available for those teachers who need extra help. For example, some need help with classroom management, others with integrating new skills with familiar ones, others with asking higher-order

questions in two languages, and still others need a great deal of help changing ingrained attitudes.

- **Human relations/cross-cultural communication skills**. As two-way bilingual programs proliferate, the talents of team teachers can be greatly enhanced with human relations and cross-cultural communication. Specific training can help dispel such myths as "getting along with others is easy;" "conflict is bad and should be avoided at all costs;" "we only have to interact with those we like;" and "racism and bigotry do not exist in my school."

- **Experiences in cross-cultural classrooms and in bilingual classrooms**. Visits and sabbaticals to observe and practice in urban, rural, mainstream, and ESOL classrooms, as well as in a variety of bilingual classrooms (e.g., transitional, immersion, dual language) are among the many opportunities provided for teachers.

Conclusion

If all students are to succeed in school, special care must be taken to give all teachers in all schools profound learning opportunities, support, freedom within a well-structured program, and the resources to do their jobs well. As demonstrated in this paper, effective programs for language minority student learning exist. These models remove many of the barriers to quality instruction by providing experiences that help educators and community members examine policies and practices that support the learning of language minority students. As more educators acquire knowledge about the issues facing language minority students and skills for helping them learn, the will to use that knowledge may finally exist on a broad enough scale that the future for all the nation's children can be bright.

Discussion Questions

1. How well do we know our individual students? Their background? Past experiences? Current situation?

2. What can our school do to help LM students map out a four-year road to success?

3. How can we educate immigrant parents about our school customs? Their new role in our schools? How can we help immigrant students and their families feel welcome and teach them to become an integral part of the school? How can we help families acclimate to the new culture?

4. How can schools help students feel proud of their home language and culture and at the same time capitalize on these assets as they become bilingual and bicultural productive citizens? How can we help immigrant students believe in

themselves, their heritage, and at the same time derive strength from past experiences to build a new and better future?

5. How can we sensitize ourselves to the emotional needs of immigrant students in order to provide the appropriate support? How can we establish a context of trust for our students?

6. Are we tracking our immigrant students? How are these tracks beneficial or detrimental to the variety of sociocultural backgrounds of our students? How can we restructure our programs to better serve their individual needs?

7. Who receives extensive staff development on teaching language minority students, in addition to the ESL teacher? What type of instructional methods do our teachers use? What percentage of teachers use cooperative learning, inquiry, discovery, or any other interactive student-centered methods, and with frequency and fidelity to those models of instruction?

References

Apple, M. W. (Ed.). (1995-1996). *Review of research in education No. 21*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Arvizu, S. (1994). Building bridges for the future. In R. A. DeVillar, C. J. Faltis, & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice* (pp. 75-100). New York: SUNY.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.

Calderón, M. (1990-91, Fall-Winter). Cooperative learning builds communities of teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education and Practice, 6*(2), 75-79.

Calderón, M. (1994a). *Bilingual teacher development within school learning communities: A synthesis of the staff development model: Annual report*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Calderón, M. (1994b). Mentoring, peer coaching, and support systems for first-year minority/bilingual teachers. In R. A. De Villar, C. J. Faltis, & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice* (pp. 117-144). New York: SUNY.

Calderón, M. (1996a). Bilingual, bicultural, and binational cooperative learning communities for students and teachers. In J. LeBlanc Flores (Ed.), *Children of la frontera: Binational efforts to serve Mexican migrant and immigrant families* (pp. 203-228). Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse.

Calderón, M. (1996b, April). *Talent development of language minority students and their teachers*. Symposium at the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Calderón, M. (1997*). Preparing teachers and administrators to better serve the needs of Latino students*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Calderón, M. (1998). *TLCs-Teachers' Learning Communities: A teacher's manual*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University.

Calderón, M., & Carreon, A. (1994). Educators and students use cooperative learning to become biliterate and bicultural. *Cooperative Learning Magazine, 4*, 6-9.

Calderón, M., & Cummins, J. (1982*). Communicative competence in bilingual education: Theory and research*. Dallas, TX: National Center for the Development of Bilingual Curriculum.

Calderón, M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., & Slavin, R. E. (1997*). Effects of bilingual cooperative integrated reading and composition on students transitioning from Spanish to English reading* (Report 10). Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

California Department of Education. (Ed.). (1986*). Beyond language. Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students*. Los Angeles: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. (1993). Empowerment through biliteracy. In J. Tinajero & A. F. Ada (Eds.*). The power of two languages* (pp. 9-25). New York: Macmillan/McGraw-Hill.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). Reframing the school reform agenda: Developing capacity for school transformation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74, 752-761.

DeVillar, R. A., Faltis, C. J., & Cummins, J. (Eds.). (1994*). Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Diaz, E., Moll, L., & Mehan, H. (1986*). Bilingual communication skills in classroom content processing*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Edelsky, C., Altwerger, B., & Flores, B. (1990). *Whole language: What's the difference?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fashola, O. S., Slavin, R. E., Calderón, M., & Duran, R. (1996). *Effective programs for Latino students in elementary and middle schools: Hispanic Dropout Project*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (1994). *Between worlds: Access to second language acquisition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's worth fighting for in your school?* New York Teachers College, Columbia University.

Goertz, M. E., Floden, R. E., & O'Day, J. (1996). *Studies in education reform: Systematic reform*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Goodman, Y. M., & Wilde, S. (Eds.). (1992). *Literacy vents in a community of young writers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

González, J. (1993, May). School meanings and their cultural bias. *Education and Urban Society*, *25*(3), 254-269.

González, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *New concepts for new challenges: Professional development for teachers of immigrant youth*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hord, S. (1997). *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hudelson, S. (1994). Literacy development of second language children. In F. Genesse (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 120-158). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Joyce, B., Wolf, J., & Calhoun, E. (1993). *The self-renewing school*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kleine-Kracht, P. A. (1993, July). The principal in a community of learning. *Journal of School Leadership, 3*(4), 391-399.

LaPoint, V., Jordan, W., McPartland, J. M., & Towns, D. P. (1996). *The talent development high school: Essential components* (Report No. 1). Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990). Teacher development in professional practice and school. *Teachers College Record, 92*, 105-22.

Long, M. H., Brock, C. A., Crookes, G., Deicke, C., Potter, L., & Zhang, S. (1984). *The effect of teachers' questioning patterns and wait-time on pupil participation in public high school classes in Hawaii for students of limited English proficiency* (Tech. Rep. No. 1). Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, Center for Second Language Classroom Research.

Lucas, T. (1996). *Into, through and beyond secondary school: Critical transitions for immigrant youth*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lucas, T. (1993). What have we learned from research on successful secondary programs for LEP students? In OBEMLA (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on middle and high school issues*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.

McDonnell, L. M., & Hill, P. T. (1993). *Newcomers in American schools: Meeting the educational needs of immigrant youth*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

McLaughlin, B., & McLeod, B. (1997). *Educating all our students: Improving education for children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Final report for the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning* (Vol. I). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Moll, L. C. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132-41.

National Coalition of Advocates for Students. (1994). *Delivering on the promise: Positive practices for immigrant students*. Boston: Author.

Newman, F. M., King, M. B., & Rigdon, M. (1997). Accountability and school performance: Implications from restructuring schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*, 41-74.

Ogbu, J. G. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. *Educational Researcher, 21*(8), 8.

Olsen, L. (1988). *Crossing the schoolhouse border: Immigrant students and the California public schools*. San Francisco: California Tomorrow.

Ovando, C., & Collier, V. (1998). *Teaching in ESL and bilingual classrooms*. New York: Macmillan.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Cummins, J. (Eds.). (1988). *Minority education: From shame to struggle*. Clevdon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Slavin, R. E., & Boykin, W. (1996). *Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk: Continuation application/performance report*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Slavin, R. E., & Fashola, O. S. (1998). *Show me the evidence! Proven and promising programs for America's schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Tinajero, J., & Ada, A. F. (Eds.). (1993*). The power of two languages: Literacy and biliteracy for Spanish-speaking students*. New York: Macmillan/McGraw Hill.

Trueba, H. T. (1987). *Success or failure? Learning and the language minority student*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1971a). *Mexican American education study. Report I: Ethnic isolation of Mexican Americans in the public schools of the Southwest*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1971b*). Mexican American education study: Report II: The unfinished education: Outcomes for minorities in the five southwestern states*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1972*). Mexican American education study: Report III: The excluded student: Educational practices affecting Mexican Americans in the southwest*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1973*). Mexican American education study: Report V: Teachers and students: Differences in teaching interaction with Mexican American and Anglo students*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1974). *Mexican American education study: Report VI: Toward quality education for Mexican Americans*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological process*. (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. and Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A. (1996). *Access and engagement: Effective program design and instructional approaches for immigrant students at the secondary level*. Manuscript for Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.

CHAPTER FOUR

PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES ON ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES IN THE STANDARDS-BASED EDUCATION MOVEMENT

by

William Demmert, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

If focusing on providing high-quality instruction and a challenging curriculum resulted in all students achieving high standards, the task would be simple: Provide high-quality instruction and challenging curriculum. Unfortunately, a number of variables influence student success (e.g., poverty, social and cultural attitudes, language, and the physical and cultural environment in which students mature). A framework for creating a standards-based system that reflects these variables is provided. The framework is organized into the following six areas: equity, curriculum, teachers and administration, school environment and culture, school ownership and community support, and organizational issues.

Dr. William G Demmert, Jr. is an associate professor in the Woodring College of Education, Western Washington University. A strong advocate of Native and Alaska Native populations, Dr. Demmert was appointed to chair the Indian Nations At-Risk Task Force and served as the primary writer for the 1991 Task Force report titled *Indian Nations at Risk: An Educational Strategy for Action*.

INTRODUCTION

As a young child, I spent a considerable amount of time with my grandparents who helped me learn the sounds and grammar of two languages (one of which I lost when I began my formal schooling). They taught me many skills that were necessary for survival in that time and place, including the skills of gathering food and helping to prepare and store food for the winter. When I reached the age of six or seven, my grandfather and uncles began to take me out on the fishing boat to observe and help them. They taught me many skills, from hanging a purse seine to navigating the coastal waters of Southeast Alaska. They taught me the importance of knowledge and the use of that knowledge in a practical and intellectual sense by requiring me to demonstrate what I had learned in real-life situations and to teach what I had learned to others once I had mastered it. For example, I remember at the age of 16 navigating in partnership with another young member of the extended family from our homeport in Alaska to the Government Locks in Ballard, Washington. To make this journey, we had to know how to read navigational charts, plot courses, and calculate time, distance, and speed in the context of ocean currents, wind patterns, and tides.

The traditional method of educating a young Tlingit man-child required that the maternal or paternal uncles serve as mentors from the day the youngster learned to walk. This mentoring process began with a daily bath in the ocean and required each uncle or member of the extended family to pass on the knowledge and skills learned from their uncles and from their own experiences. My uncles were experts in the practical knowledge of the land, the sea, and the weather. They understood time, distance, and space and had integrated knowledge of their world into the lore and fabric of their being a Tlingit. It is now my responsibility, and that of my brothers, to pass on the knowledge we have gained to our grandchildren and nephews of the new generation.

The cultural climate and setting of my uncles' learning environments and mine as a young person were congruent with the mores and cultures of the communities in which we lived. There was no conflict among the system used for passing on skills and information, the cultural climate, and what we learned. The learning climate in which I was constantly tested was challenging, comfortable, and closely monitored. Failure was not an option for my uncles as mentors or for me as the student. It is important to comment that this system for transferring knowledge from one generation to the next worked very well (even in contemporary times), that expectations were high (e.g., failure was not allowed), and that the standard to which each nephew was held was a clear demonstration of competence.

The promotion of high standards — as the national strategy to improve academic performance among all students — is based on the premise that all students are capable of achieving high standards if they receive high-quality instruction and a challenging curriculum. Thus, high-quality instruction and a challenging curriculum are organizational issues on which educators must focus their attention and efforts. Certainly the instruction I received from my uncles was high quality and the curriculum was challenging. Unlike me, however, most culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students are not in an education system that takes their needs into account. For these students, the language and cultural context of the school and the community may not be congruent; the environment of the classroom and approaches used by teachers to pass on knowledge may be in conflict with local reality, and the knowledge to be transferred may not be inclusive or challenging enough for the community served by the school. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the organizational issues related to high-quality instruction and challenging curriculum in the context of meeting the needs of CLD student populations.

A Framework for a Standards-Based Education System that Serves All Students

If focusing simply on providing high quality instruction and a challenging curriculum resulted in all students achieving high standards, the task would be simple: Provide high-quality instruction and challenging curriculum. Unfortunately, there are a number of variables such as poverty, social and cultural attitudes, language, and the physical and intellectual environment in which a youngster matures that influence his or her academic success in the formal school setting. The following section, organized into six areas (equity, curriculum, teachers and administration, school environment and culture, school ownership and community support, and

organizational issues), provides a framework for a standards-based system that reflects these variables. The narrative for each area includes a set of questions that defines the issues to be considered in the area.

Equity of Access

Equity of access depends not only on the teacher's ability to provide quality instruction, but also on the district's ability to keep class sizes small, to recruit and retain well-trained and knowledgeable teachers, to equip its schools with vital resources, and to maintain an aesthetically appealing facility. Obviously, money is necessary to develop, offer, and maintain an efficient and responsive educational program, but money alone is not the answer. Districts must also enact policies and develop programs that promote access for all students.

Family economic status and stability also influence how well a student performs in school. We know that young children who have access to well-managed and well-equipped play areas, museums (and other activities related to the fine arts), vacations, story books, and other reading materials have advantages that help build their intellectual skills, when compared to children who do not have access to such experiences and resources. Thus, it is particularly important for poor children, many of whom are culturally or linguistically diverse, to have access to high-quality facilities and materials in their schools.

Key questions to consider in this area are

- Do all students have access to quality instruction and full participation in the education system?
- Do all students have access to teachers who are well educated, use pedagogically sound practices, and are professionally trained to work with diverse student populations?
- Do all students have access to adequate high-quality school facilities and educational materials?
- Do classrooms have computers for all students, access to the Internet, and competent mentors in the Internet and computer media?

Curriculum

If we expect our youth to respond to the challenges presented by high academic standards, we must recognize that the content and quality of the curriculum must be stimulating — students must be motivated, and they must have authentic opportunities to learn. Students must be exposed to the competencies they are expected to learn; the context of the school and the classroom must be congruent with students' home, cultural, and language base; students must be

challenged to high standards in the national language when it differs from the language spoken in their homes; and the perspectives of the curriculum must be aligned with the many perspectives that have formed the contemporary American culture. The traditional view of textbooks as the focus of instruction may no longer be appropriate. Perhaps, instead, textbooks should be viewed as a resource, as a complement to the library — and students should research, write, and direct the creation of their own curricula with the aid of technology such as computers, videotapes, and the Internet.

Key questions to consider in this area are

- Is the curriculum high quality and designed to challenge the development of higher-order thinking skills?
- Does the curriculum linguistically and culturally support the immediate community served by the school as well as the larger society?
- What is the cultural and political context of the material presented?
- Are minority perspectives and contributions recognized as part of the curriculum?
- Is the curriculum aligned with standards and assessments?

Teachers and Administration

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996), in its report *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*, emphasizes that "what teachers know and do is the most important influence on what students learn" (p. 6). In addition to subject-area and teaching competencies, teacher attitudes regarding a student's language, culture, and heritage critically influence the student's motivation and attitudes about school and life. Every teacher must be prepared to ensure that all students under his or her care learn. As professionals we cannot allow or expect failure. We must avoid creating an atmosphere in the classroom in which culture or language is a means to exclude youth from developing their academic skills and acquiring knowledge.

Key questions to consider in this area are

- Are teachers and school administrators representative of the diverse student population that the school serves?
- Do teachers and administrators live in the community served, and do they participate in community activities?

- Are teachers and administrators knowledgeable and supportive of the language and cultural base of the community?

- Does the standards-based education system give teachers and the institution the flexibility to meet the diverse needs of different students?

School Environment and Culture

The cultural environment of the United States is consistently referred to as "Western European." Yet, when we look carefully at the contributions of the many groups that are part of today's American culture, we find that a variety of other ethnic and cultural groups also have contributed significant threads to that culture. The cultural environment of most schools, however, does not actively represent the contributions of the many communities that the public education system was created to serve.

In fact, some students view schools as hostile environments — not in terms of physical dangers, but in terms of the mental, cultural, intellectual, and academic hostility of the school's cultural environment. In 1969, the U.S. Senate issued a report on Indian education titled *Indian Education: A National Tragedy — A National Challenge*. The report pointed out that some Indians viewed school as "the enemy." Opportunities for tribes or parents to influence the curriculum, help plan and evaluate the program that Indian children attend, and to operate their own schools under tribal authority may help to change this view.

Key questions to consider in this area are

- Do the school's curriculum and activities reflect the salient cultural values and mores of the different communities that it serves?

- Do the school's environment and culture promote the development of the languages and cultures of the students and communities that it serves?

- Do students have educationally sound opportunities to learn their heritage, their native languages, and the English language at a high academic level (or other languages when their original language is English)?

School Ownership and Community Support

The school is owned by those who determine the curriculum, set the policies, and benefit directly from what is taught in the classroom. When a school's environment, culture, curriculum, teachers, and administrators do not support the community served, the school is viewed as belonging to someone else, to people outside the local community. Policies such as the Indian Education Act of 1972 promote parental participation in education programs and help build a sense of ownership of the school system.

Key questions to consider in this area are

- Do parents, community leaders, and the public at large generally support the school?
- Do parents, community leaders, and the public at large believe in what the school is teaching?
- Do parents, community leaders, and the public at large feel a sense of local ownership of the school?

Organizational Issues

Although legislative efforts can address many of the organizational issues confronting minority groups today, political and professional differences of opinion and attitudes among policymakers sometimes lead to legislation that negatively affects diverse students (e.g., legislation in California prohibiting the use of languages other than English as the language of instruction). It is not clear how such differences of opinion and attitude can be overcome — perhaps by informing policymakers about relevant research and best practice, or by acquiring political power so that the most effective findings can be incorporated into legislation or policy.

Key questions to consider in this area are

- What policies and legislation at the state or national levels should be enacted to accommodate the needs of language and cultural minority students?
- Are there policies that protect the rights of language and cultural minority groups by valuing their diversity and encouraging the development of their unique languages and cultures as resources?
- Does the state funding system provide equitable funding for "rich" and "poor" districts? (Funding must take into consideration parity for Indian children attending federally funded Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.)
- Do policies provide adequate funding for school facilities to ensure that physical school environments are educationally sound?

Do policies recognize the critical role of parents and communities in the educational process, thus creating a sense of community ownership?

Sharing the Responsibility for Teaching

The responsibility for the education of young children has moved from the home or community to the formal classroom, and from learning through the practical application of skills and knowledge to more abstract learning from written text, pencil-and-paper exercises, and, more recently, the computer. The demands for excellence and the source of motivation for what one learns have moved from the family and mentor to the teacher and school administrator. As students, parents, and community members, we have lost something in the transition. That "something" is the active role of the parent and the extended community (e.g., the uncle in the Tlingit community) in working directly with our children.

The transition to learning in new locations and environments (especially if the learning environments are well designed and well equipped) is not so difficult for students. Adjusting to changes in the mentoring relationship, however, is not so easily accomplished. In the new learning environment it is necessary to share the mentoring responsibility among parents, the larger community, teachers, and administrators. Determining how that responsibility is to be shared is not an easy task.

The ability to motivate and challenge students to learn is a critical aspect that is missing in the schools of today. The informal educational environment of my youth was challenging. My uncles made sure that I was motivated. Today most people recognize that teachers, the organizational structure of schools, and the standards-based education movement are not capable of doing the job of education without the direct assistance of parents and the full support of the communities they serve.

Conclusion

The United States is a nation with a broad mix of ethnic groups and cultures. It is a nation that has benefited significantly from the contributions of many different peoples; yet its schools have not yet reached a maturity level where all children are comfortable and expected to succeed. The realities of class and income, language and cultural differences, expectations and education priorities challenge our best thinking as we struggle to build schools that serve all children. We must, however, consider these issues if all children are to be successful in a standards-based system.

Although in some ways we are making progress, much remains to be done. We have progressed in the sense that schools are doing a better job of addressing the organizational issues that educators face as they struggle to carry out their responsibilities to the communities they serve. Public officials are beginning to recognize that schools must take into account the many social factors that influence a student's well-being. However, we have regressed when a state like California overwhelmingly votes to limit opportunities for children to learn their heritage language (and thus limit their opportunity to learn English as a Second Language as well as other languages). In this instance, it is clear that educators have not done their job well as advocates for all children.

When students' language and cultural background differ from those that are familiar to most citizens, when the school curriculum fails to recognize the contributions of the many, and when the system is threatened by change, it becomes increasingly critical to step back and recognize that there is a large world out there that we all must live in. Educators and policymakers must work on these organizational issues if schools are to move into a higher level of service that challenges all students to meet high standards.

Discussion Questions

1. If the early life environment significantly influences the intellectual development of the child (and, therefore, his/her academic potential), what responsibilities (organizational or otherwise) must society assume if all children are to begin their formal education process "ready to learn."

2. What kind of school culture must society create in order to build a pluralistic society?

3. If the development of a person's first language is critical to developing understanding of language and is to be used in the development of other languages, how must the focus of schooling and the curriculum change in order to support this?

4. Do schools have a responsibility to incorporate traditional knowledge and systems of education that are unique to the Native communities?

5. What issues must society address and resolve if schools are to meet the academic needs of all students and challenge them to high standards?

References

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America 's Future*. New York: Author.

Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (1969). *Indian Education: A national tragedy — a national challenge* (U.S. Senate Report No. 91-501). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

CHAPTER FIVE

ASSESSMENT OF CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE STUDENTS: CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE 21st CENTURY

by

Aida Walqui, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

If the K-12 school system is to be supportive of students who are English language learners, more attention must be given to issues facing these students. This paper explores several such issues and examines the role that opportunity-to-learn standards and standards for English as a Second Language can play in promoting the achievement of English language learners. An explanation of the role of authentic assessment and examples of its effective use also are provided.

Dr. Aida Walqui is an assistant professor in the Division of Education at the University of California at Santa Cruz. She has extensive experience in the field of foreign and second language teaching at the elementary and secondary levels. Dr. Walqui has authored two books on the teaching of Spanish for Spanish speakers and a book on teaching Spanish as a second language in intercultural, bilingual programs.

INTRODUCTION

Two major trends have characterized the field of American education in the last three decades tremendous changes in school demographics that have rendered American students the most diverse of any country in the world and calls for reform that have as their central goal the attainment of higher standards by all students. How these two forces interplay, the possibilities they present for the increasing number of English language learners[1] (ELL) in K-12, the advantages and the dangers in using standards and new forms of assessment with these students, and other tensions connected to standards-based reform are the primary concerns of this paper.

CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS

Growth in the number of English language learners in the school system was triggered by three major policy changes in the United States: (1) the immigration reform of 1965, which permitted significant increases in the number of immigrants from Asia and Latin America; (2)

[1] The term English language learners was coined by Lacelle-Peterson & Rivera, 1994.

the 1986 amnesty program, which allowed three million formerly unauthorized immigrants to legalize their situation in the United States; and (3) the Immigration Act of 1990, which increased regular immigrant visas by 40 percent over the levels reached in the 1980s (Portes & Rumbaut, 1996).

According to the 1990 U.S. census, 14 percent of the total school population were language minority children — children who lived in a home where a language other than English was spoken. Many of these students did not speak English or did not speak it well enough to succeed academically in classes conducted exclusively in English. The top nine languages spoken by students in U.S. schools were Spanish, representing 73 percent of the total ELL population; Vietnamese, 3.9 percent; Hmong, 1.8 percent; Cantonese, 1.7 percent; Cambodian, 1.6 percent; Korean, 1.6 percent; Laotian, 1.3 percent; Navajo, 1.3 percent; and Tagalog, 1.3 percent (August & Hakuta, 1997).

A recently released study conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1998) found that in 1995 there were 2.4 million school-age children who spoke a language other than English at home and who had limited proficiency in English, up from 1.25 million in 1979. These 2.4 million students represented 5 percent, on average, of all school-age children in the country, a number that varied from 2 percent in the Midwest to 11 percent in the West. The majority of English language learners, 67 percent, were concentrated in five states: California, Texas, New York, Florida, and Illinois. However, the increase in diversity that these statistics reflect has been felt all over the country. In fact, one can argue that the educational impact caused by the presence of a few immigrant students who do not speak English, in an area that is unaccustomed to or unprepared for them, can be more overwhelming than the presence of many in areas that have already developed response mechanisms to try to meet their needs (Walqui, 1999).

English language learners overwhelmingly come from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds, a situation that is worsening. For example, between the late 1970s and the early-to-mid 1990s, the poverty rate for young children increased by 30 percent among the White population, while it grew by 54 percent among Hispanics (who, as we have seen, constitute the largest percentage of ELLs) and by 15 percent among Blacks (National Center for Children in Poverty, 1998). Seventy-seven percent of ELLs in schools were eligible for reduced or free meals, compared with 38 percent of all students (August & Hakuta, 1998). Prospects (a congressionally mandated, national longitudinal study of representative students in Chapter 1/Title I) found that a large percentage of ELLs attend schools where 75 to 100 percent of their classmates live in poverty.

Given these dramatic statistics, as well as the increases that are estimated to continue over the next two decades (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1998), it is important to ask how ELLs are faring in the education system. Unfortunately, useful data on education outcomes for these students are extremely sparse, in part because ELLs were exempted from participation in tests due to their limited proficiency in English. In addition, some of the data that are available are not valid given students' limited proficiency in the language in which they were tested. The little information we do have paints a bleak picture of school achievement. For example, prospects offers some measure of ELLs' achievement in the lower grades. Students were tested using the

Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills in its English (CTBS) or Spanish (SABE) version, depending on their language proficiency. Scores showed that ELLs performed significantly below general population norms in reading and math (Moss & Puma, 1995). For both tests, performance was strongly correlated to the concentration of students from poor families; thus, the higher the concentration of poor children in the school, the lower the learner's performance. However, when the data were disaggregated between language minority students who spoke English and ELLs, it was possible to see how students' limited English proficiency contributed to their lower scores. For the third-grade cohort, for example, English-speaking language minority students in high poverty schools scored at the 26.9 mean percentile; ELLs in the same schools scored at the 15.5 percentile. This same low pattern of performance, which is further affected by limited English proficiency, is repeated across other grades that were studied.

Another statistic that reveals the dire situation in which ELLs find themselves is the high dropout rate, especially among Spanish-speaking students. For example, in 1989, 31.3 percent of Spanish speakers dropped out of school, compared to 10.5 percent of English-only speakers. Still another revealing measure is the small number of ELLs who graduate from high school with the prerequisites to attend a four-year institution. In addition, many students who do make it into college have to enroll in remedial courses.

Prevailing Misconceptions About The Education Of English Language Learners

There are at least two reasons that it is important to firmly establish the connection between poverty and low levels of education achievement for English language learners. First, many people think that the only "problem" to be solved in the education of ELLs is their lack of English proficiency — that once students "learn English," everything else will fall into place for them. California has witnessed this lack of understanding of the complex issues involved in the school failure of ELLs with the passage of Proposition 227 — an attempt to legislate an English-only education so that immigrant students learn English and succeed in life. Although education is important for the future success of all students, many other societal issues must be resolved before minority populations can have access to occupational and economic success. As Kaplan (1997) reminds us:

> The concept that . . . providing a transition for a disadvantaged segment of the population to be admitted to the corridors of power via language instruction is fallacious . . . it cannot accomplish the implied purpose since access to social mobility and political power is only partially a function of language proficiency. (p. xii)

Having said this, it is important to acknowledge that a high school diploma is critically important for students. High school graduates have better rates of employment and, consequently, better economic opportunities than students who do not graduate from high school, regardless of the quality of the education they received (National Center for Children in Poverty, 1998). This is another reason for concern about the high dropout rate among English language learners, and

among Latino students in particular. Educators Wolf and Reardon (1996) discuss education as a "passport out of the ruthless bottom half of an increasingly bimodally distributed economy" (p. 2).

Another prevailing misconception is one that Warren and Rosebery (1995) describe as "equity in the present tense," that is, the idea that it will be a great day when English language learners learn English because they will be able to catch up with the mainstream. However, performance similar to that of the majority of English-only speaking students in the American education system would be an insufficient accomplishment, given the current state of mainstream education. Kozol (1988) asserts that the current American education system is characterized by "savage inequalities," that is, that a small percentage of the population — the "haves" — receive high-quality education, while an increasing proportion of the population — the "have nots" — attend schools that have inadequate resources, low morale, and inadequate pedagogy.

A 1988 report by the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life (quoted in Miller, 1995) painted a gloomy picture of the consequences of these major differences in educational, social, and economic attainment between majority and minority populations:

> America is moving backward — not forward — in its efforts to achieve the full participation of minority citizens in the life and prosperity of the nation.
>
> In education, employment, income, health, longevity, and other basic measures of individual and social well being, gaps persist — and in some cases are widening — between members of minority groups and the majority population.
>
> If these disparities are allowed to continue, the United States inevitably will suffer a compromised quality of life and a lower standard of living. Social conflict will intensify. Our ability to compete in world markets will decline, our domestic economy will falter, and our national security will be endangered. In brief, we will find ourselves unable to fulfill the promise of the American dream. (p. 2)

The Need for Higher Standards

Changes in the demands placed on schooling have come from varied sources — from historical changes, from the realization that the country was falling behind other leading nations in the world, and from developments in our understanding of the teaching/learning process.

During the industrial period, the United States did not educate all of its citizens alike. One of the coping mechanisms used by schools to try to balance societal demands for a unified citizenry was educational triage — investing resources only in those students considered likely to succeed. There were two ways of legitimizing this "creaming" of students: (1) through a functional ideology, which stated that schooling was the way in which more capable individuals were chosen for important positions; and (2) through a conflict ideology, which maintained that

investing more resources in some students was justified by virtue of their station in life (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1995). Whatever the rationale, society agreed that this was the way things were supposed to be. In addition, an emphasis on low-level skills in the education of most students was not perceived as very problematic because, at the time, there were plenty of jobs, especially for unskilled workers.

As the United States moved from an industrial to a knowledge- and communications-based society and as the position of the country changed in the world economy, demands on schools changed. Successful high school graduates today are required to have higher levels of literacy and be able to generate, use, and transfer knowledge. Those who can generate, use, and communicate knowledge are more likely to obtain, hold, and advance in jobs. Those who have not developed sophisticated knowledge and skills take up the responsibilities of earlier servant classes (Heath, 1995). A great percentage of English language learners hold these lower types of jobs, which condemns them to a life of poverty. In addition, fewer and fewer unskilled jobs are available today. For all of these reasons, attaining higher levels of education levels is unquestionably important.

Calls for reform of educational processes and content also resulted from the realization that focusing on students' development of basic skills was no longer sufficient in a world in which the requirements for success had increased. In addition, there was an acknowledgment that the United States suffered from a comparative economic disadvantage in world markets, a situation that needed to be corrected. Education critics have emphasized the need for national success primarily because of a concern about the country's standing in international comparisons of educational achievement. Yet, the American democratic participatory system requires the attainment of higher education standards by all students.

A third impetus for education reform has resulted from changing views of learning, language, and knowledge. Unlike the behavioristic, transmission-oriented understanding of learning, sociocultural educators consider learning a process of apprenticeship in which children grow into the intellectual lives of those around them (Vygotsky, 1978) through a social process of modeling and appropriation (Brown & Campione, 1994; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Similarly, language, knowledge, and skills are considered today to be jointly constructed by human beings. Based on this view, language becomes perceived, noticed, used, and elaborated on as part of the activity of the learner in tasks, projects, and interpersonal relationships that are meaningful, challenging, interesting, and well scaffolded (Walqui, 1999). These views challenge static notions of a "banking" form of education (Freire, 1974) in which the teacher is the depository of knowledge and teaching is the transmission of this knowledge to a passive, receptive student.

Responding to these three primary forces for change, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act was signed into law by President Clinton on March 31, 1994. This act codified the national education goals and provided resources to states and communities to help them develop and implement education reforms aimed at helping all students reach challenging academic standards. The passing of this act was based on the recognition that the education system must serve all students equally well and that in order to carry out system-wide reforms, a "carrot and stick" approach needed to be implemented — thus the emphasis on accountability. Standards and

assessment became rallying terms around which educators nationwide expressed their support for or disapproval of the new reform concepts.

Reform issues were also on the minds of educators concerned about the impact on ELLs of the Goals 2000 legislation. In September 1993, a group of scholars met at Stanford University to discuss the implications of a standards-based reform for these students; they subsequently published a report on their deliberations and consensus (August & Hakuta, 1993). These meetings were followed by others that more specifically addressed the research and development needed to incorporate ELLs into the thrust of school reform. Two overarching principles guided their work:

1. Language-minority students must be provided with an equal opportunity to learn the same challenging content and high level skills that school reform movements advocate for all students.

2. Proficiency in two or more languages should be promoted for all American students. Bilingualism enhances cognitive and social growth, competitiveness in a global marketplace, national security, and understanding of diverse peoples and cultures. (August, Hakuta, & Pompa, 1994, p. 6)

It is important to keep these principles in mind when framing the reform agenda for English language learners. It would be unfair and un-American to provide less for students who are in the process of developing a second language at the same time that they are learning new academic concepts and skills. But the Stanford Working Group went beyond this basic statement of justice. These scholars insisted that the connotation of compensatory education — an inheritance from its federal birth during the Great Society era — be removed from bilingual education by emphasizing the value of bilingualism for all and proposing that it serve not just minority students, but all students. There has been some isolated progress since the 1993 Stanford meeting, but there are still many more tasks to tackle in the endeavor of improving the education of ELLs. This paper now turns to a discussion of what is entailed in the setting up of clear standards, in ensuring that teachers and other school personnel know how to design and implement them, and in developing and implementing richer, more appropriate assessment tools.

Standards and English Language Learners

It has become commonplace in education to say that all students can achieve high standards. But what do we mean when we repeat this mantra of school reform with reference to English language learners, who are currently languishing in the system? (August & Hakuta, 1997; Olsen, 1995). Perhaps we should consider how the Stanford Working Group phrased the need to hold students to high standards: "Language-minority students must be provided with an equal opportunity to learn the same challenging content and high level skills that school reform movements advocate for all students" (August, Hakuta, & Pompa, 1994, p. 6). There are several points that should be highlighted here in order to clearly understand how standards may affect ELLs and native speakers of English differently.

First, ELLs must acquire English language skills and knowledge that students who arrive in school speaking English already possess. This knowledge encompasses not only linguistic knowledge, but also cultural understandings that are essential for effective participation in the life of the school and the community. English language learners, then, must develop sociolinguistic proficiency in addition to literacy and subject-matter knowledge. The key focus of efforts, both in the teaching and assessment of ELLs, has been on English language proficiency, as if this was the sole purpose of schooling. Learning school subject matter, work skills, and the skills needed to effectively participate in a democratic society were seen as secondary or nonexistent from this myopic perspective. This practice was primarily determined by the push for accountability of bilingual programs from state governments and the federal government, which narrowed their concern to the question: Are students learning English?

This restricted focus on English language learning also has led teachers and administrators to assume that the general English developed in ESL classes provides students with the linguistic tools necessary for successfully understanding complex subject matter. However, different subjects have different core structures, or epistemologies, thus making different demands on the learner (August & Hakuta, 1997; Warren & Rosebery, 1992). Consequently, learning to speak about daily routines — typically the core of ESL classes — does not necessarily prepare the learner to discuss a lab experiment conducted in the science class or to engage in other academic activities. Furthermore, it is also possible that the discourse patterns used in a discipline in English may differ from the preferred structure given to the same discipline in other languages. For example, a comparison of high school history textbooks in English and in Spanish reveals two very distinct ways of approaching and discussing the subject matter.

Another issue raised by the potential differences in subject discourse practices across languages is that courses taught in a student's native language may not sufficiently prepare the student for later success when the same courses are taught in English. For example, teaching a Spanish-speaking student history in Spanish may not necessarily be the bridge that enables the student to immediately and successfully shift into history instruction in English once he or she has achieved an acceptable level of development in English. To help ELLs succeed, it may be necessary to first take the time to help them become aware of some of the primary differences between the two languages in the organization of discourse.

The situation is compounded by the highly tracked nature of the current education system. On one hand, ELLs often are offered low-level courses and anemic teaching, resulting in higher dropout rates, especially among Hispanics and Native Americans, than for other groups (August, Hakuta, & Pompa, 1994). On the other hand, the practice of teacher tracking is also well-established — that is, good teachers who have tested themselves teaching ELLs are "promoted" to mainstream classes, thus leaving less-experienced and less-qualified teachers with these students (Minicucci & Olsen, 1992; Olsen, 1995; META, 1995; Walqui, 1999). In this situation, it can be beneficial to have clearly articulated standards of excellence in teaching, content, classroom practices, and results and a system of accountability based on the achievement of these goals. The next section of this paper discusses how the different types of standards can positively impact the education of ELLs.

Content Standards

Content standards are broad, curricular goal statements that "describe the knowledge, skills, and other understandings that schools should teach in order for students to attain high levels of competency in challenging subject matter" (National Council on Education Standards and Testing, 1992, p. 13).

There is no single view of what content standards should include, how detailed they should be, or what presentation format may be most useful. A recent study of academic standards developed and used by different states confirms this variability both in format and in quality (National Education Goals Panel, 1998). This report also states that given the amount of work accomplished by different groups to develop standards, the time may be right to begin discussions across projects and seek consensus on the essential features of good standards. This process may also establish a common framework and terminology for future work in the area.

Some people have argued that the same language arts standards should apply to both English native speakers and to English language learners from the time they begin their education in the United States. (For an example, see the California Language Arts Standards, California Department of Education, 1997.) Such a perspective ignores the fact that English language learners arrive in this country at all ages, many of them as middle or high school students. They have developed a level of proficiency in their own language that is appropriate for their age, but they usually have no proficiency in English. We should ask ourselves if it is reasonable to expect a ninth-grade student who speaks no English to enroll and participate in a freshman English class. Many would argue that it is not reasonable and that ESL standards are needed to ensure that the process of teaching students to speak English is rigorous and that students learn what they need to know to communicate in the variety of situations they will encounter in the United States.

This argument does not mean that the same rigorous language arts standards should not apply to English language learners. Indeed, these students must be educated to the same standards; however, to achieve these standards in the English language arts, English language learners must first meet prerequisite, or preliminary, ESL standards. The relationship between these two sets of standards is a key question that must be continually addressed within and between groups involved in English language development and subject-matter standards.

The members of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), the largest professional organization of teachers of English as a foreign or second language, believe that there should be separate standards for English language learners that feed into standards written for the mainstream population. This was also the recommendation of The Stanford Working Group on Federal Programs for Limited English Proficient Students (August, Hakuta, & Pompa, 1994) and of a national panel on standards-based education reform (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995).

TESOL recently published (1997) the first set of standards after several years of concerted work by many of its members nationwide. Their work identified three goals for sociolinguistic development:

1. to use English to communicate in social settings;

2. to use English to achieve academically in all content areas; and

3. to use English in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

Nine broad standards specify the language competencies that English language learners in elementary and secondary schools must have in order to be provided with a bridge to the general education standards expected of all students in the United States. These standards specify the language competencies needed in elementary and secondary schools so that English language learners can become fully proficient in English, "to have unrestricted access to grade-appropriate instruction in challenging academic subjects, and ultimately to lead rich and productive lives" (TESOL, 1997, p. 2). TESOL's ESL standards publication includes descriptors, sample progress indicators (which may assist in the establishment of benchmarks), and classroom vignettes that exemplify the standards in action.

The TESOL standards for K-12 students (TESOL, 1997) set out clear and unambiguous learning objectives for English language learners, while delineating progress indicators for English language development. Discussing these standards and their adaptation and implementation at individual sites can be very beneficial for teachers, and the standards can provide clear goals and coherent objectives to address the needs of English language learners. For example, TESOL (1997) Goal 2, Standard 3 states:

> To use English to achieve academically in all content areas: Students will use appropriate learning strategies to construct and apply academic knowledge. (p. 135)

The descriptors that accompany Goal 2 reference the use of metacognitive skills such as "applying self-monitoring and self-corrective strategies to build and expand a knowledge base" and "evaluating one's own success in a completed learning task" (p. 91). Descriptors also contain schema-building activities such as "actively connecting new information to information previously learned" and "using context to construct meaning" (p. 91).

Apart from the TESOL standards, no state has yet published standards in this area. However, a number of school districts have worked to develop their own ESL standards based on the experience of TESOL and a truncated California project to develop standards for English language development.

Performance Standards

Performance standards are concrete examples and explicit definitions of what students should know and be able to do to demonstrate proficiency in the skills, knowledge, and understanding framed by the content standards (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995). Consider the following mathematics example from the high school volume of *Performance Standards*, developed by the New Standards Project (1997b):

> The student uses the language of mathematics, its symbols, notation, graphs, and expressions, to communicate through reading, writing, speaking, and listening, and communicates about mathematics by describing mathematical ideas and concepts and explaining reasoning and results; that is, the student:
>
> - is familiar with basic mathematical terminology, standard notation and use of symbols, common conventions for graphing, and general features of effective mathematical communication styles.
> - uses mathematical representations with appropriate accuracy, including numerical tables, formulas, functions, equations, charts, graphs, and diagrams.
> - organizes work and presents mathematical procedures and results clearly, systematically, succinctly, and correctly.
> - communicates logical arguments clearly, showing why a result makes sense and why the reasoning is valid.
> - presents mathematical ideas effectively both orally and in writing (p. 56).

These standards, along with standards proposed in other content areas that engage students in powerful work, ought to apply to all learners. However, since sophisticated language use is required to meet them, it may be necessary for classes to be taught in the students' first language if there is a critical mass of students who speak the language in the school and well-prepared teachers who can teach the subject in the language with sophistication. Such classes must adhere to the same rigorous standards that govern courses taught in English.

As discussed previously, problems arise when we consider requiring students who do not speak English to meet English language arts standards. Consider, for example, an English language arts task found in the elementary school volume of *Performance Standards*, developed by the New Standards Project (1997a). The task requires students to develop a picture book from an entry in their writer's notebook. Students first recite the stories in small response groups then write drafts of their stories, and, finally, create their picture books. Table 5.1 includes some of the standards that the students are expected to meet.

The goals described in Table 5.1 are excellent goals for all students, but when they guide the performance of the English language learner student in English, they should vary depending

on the level of proficiency that the student has developed in English. A well-defined continuum of developing proficiency using performance standards can only add rigor to ESL classes and promote smooth transitions into rigorous subject-matter courses taught exclusively in English.

Opportunity-to-Learn Standards

> *Students cannot be held fairly to the same standard of performance if they are given unequal opportunities to learn.* (Koretz, Madaus, Haertel, & Beaton, 1992)

Having clear standards can only be useful in the educational experience of English language learners if these standards are coupled with opportunity-to-learn (OTL) standards and with the availability of authentic assessment. ESL standards in and of themselves will not guarantee that students achieve:

> Given the existing vast inequalities in resources available to American youth — both inside and outside of school — educators, reform advocates, and others worried that higher standards, particularly if combined with high stakes assessments, would further disadvantage large numbers of already underserved students. OTL standards were thus conceived as a way to protect students from being further penalized for inequities in the system. (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995, p. 42)

Opportunity-to-learn standards define the level and availability of programs, staff, and other resources that are needed in order for all students to meet challenging content and performance standards. Opportunity-to-learn standards respond to the fundamental question of equity: Do all students have the learning opportunities that they need in order to meet the standards? These learning opportunities include such elements as teachers who are well prepared to teach ESL and to teach in their respective content areas; available instructional materials and resources that are adequate to meet instructional goals; a safe school environment in which ELLs are respected, valued, and made to feel welcome into the community of learners represented in the classroom; and courses and instructional activities that are consistent with demanding content and performance standards.

Table 5.1
Sample Ass ssment for Language Arts Standards

Standards

Writing:	Produce a narrative account
Conventions:	Demonstrate a basic understanding of the rules of the English language
Literature:	Produce work in at least one literary genre that follows the conventions of the genre

The Task

Students were asked to take an entry from their writer's notebook and develop it into a picture book. This student chose two entries describing her grandmother's house. After reciting them as a story in a small response group, she wrote a rough draft that eventually developed into the picture book she titles "The Stained Glass Tree."

Circumstances of Performance

This sample of student work was produced under the following conditions:

✔ alone	___ in a group
✔ in class	✔ as homework
✔ with teacher feedback	✔ peer feedback
___ timed	✔ opportunity for revision

What the Work Shows

Writing: The student produces a narrative account (fictional or autobiographical) that:

- engages the reader by establishing a context, creating a point of view, and otherwise developing reader interest;
- establishes a situation, plot, point of view, setting, and conflict (and for autobiography, the significance of events);
- creates an organizing structure
- includes relevant details and concrete language to develop plot and characters;
- excludes extraneous details and inconsistencies;
- develops complex characters;
- uses a range of appropriate strategies, such as dialogue and tension or suspense; and
- provides a sense of closure to the writing.

The work engages the reader by establishing the point of view of the narrator walking the reading through her grandmother's home while providing a detailed description of the house. (p. 40)

Note: From *Performance Standards* (p. 40), by the New Standards Project, 1997, Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy, and the University of Pittsburgh.

One of the most important rationales offered for the existence of opportunity-to-learn standards is the belief that underserved students should not be further penalized by a system that remains vastly unequal and that has been detrimental to their success. In order to guarantee the success of ELLs in schooling, it is vital to offer them

- teachers who are well prepared in the content area and who know how to effectively teach discipline-specific English;
- teachers who have opportunities for professional development that engage them in reflecting and establishing significant opportunity-to-learn standards in their teaching contexts;
- the same accountability systems that apply to all other students; and
- challenging curriculum, adequate resources, and ongoing monitoring of student progress.

Well-Prepared Teachers

English language learners must have teachers who are well prepared in the content area and who know how to effectively teach discipline-specific English. As noted earlier, the "problem" for ELLs has been narrowly defined as purely linguistic, one of acquiring enough English so that students can effectively participate in classes taught solely via the medium of that language. Left out of this appraisal is the fact that at the same time, students need to develop subject-specific knowledge and academic skills. Furthermore, students should learn that knowledge in-depth — they must be able to build intricate networks of concept relationships and organize and reorganize their understandings in light of new information. There should be an adequate number of qualified teachers assigned to provide this instruction. A school that has a high percentage of ELLs should make a concerted effort to attract and retain teachers who are highly prepared to work in English language development and deep disciplinary work.

However, teaching English language learners is not just a matter of technical expertise, but also of commitment to the present and future lives of the students and of having a vision of society that builds on diversity to create an American cultural dialogue. Issues of teacher motivation, knowledge of self, collegiality, the ability to reflect, and the ability to learn from that reflection are as indispensable to the making of a good teacher as pedagogical knowledge, subject-matter expertise, and pedagogical content knowledge (Walqui, 1999).

Professional Development Opportunities

In a recent study, Darling-Hammond and Ball (1997), using information from a study by Ronald Ferguson, demonstrated that teachers' expertise, as measured by education level, scores on a licensing examination, and experience, "accounted for far more variation in students' achievement than any other factor (about 40 percent of the total), and that every additional dollar

spent on more highly qualified teachers netted greater increases in student achievement than did any other use of school resources" (p. 2).

Professional development is key to ensuring that ELLs have highly qualified teachers. The nature of that professional development, however, is quite different from what has traditionally characterized professional development. English language learners must have teachers who have opportunities for professional development that engage them in reflecting about and establishing significant opportunity-to-learn standards in their teaching contexts. These opportunities are essential to the development of a teacher's knowledge base and expertise. This professional development is premised on moving from transmission-oriented inservices to meetings where teachers actively construct their understandings and enact major changes in practice, self-perception, and professionalism. Teacher learning must be reconceptualized along the same lines as student learning — as active, long term, purposeful, reflective, collegial, and powerful. In this respect a key question to ask is, "Do schools offer new ways to support the individual and organizational learning of teachers and other school personnel involved?" As concepts of teacher professional development change, so do the structures that support them.

A Single Accountability System

English language learners must be included in the same accountability systems that apply to all other students. When students are not performing well, the question arises, "Do their schools have the same capacity and commitment to offer quality education as other schools in which students succeed?" Exploring answers to this question could lead to closer monitoring and support of schools, instead of blaming the students. Currently, large numbers of students, including many who are ELLs, are not given local and state exams that count for school accountability. Although this may superficially seem to be good practice, in reality it disengages schools and teachers from the responsibility of teaching these students. On the other hand, if state exams are given to all students with consequences for the school and not the children, positive change could result. As McLaughlin and Shepard (1995) explain:

> When performance standards and assessments are used for school accountability purposes, individual students are not at risk. In fact, students are likely to benefit if instructional inadequacies are identified and remedied in response to assessment results. (p. 40)

The crucial variable affecting the success of reform efforts is the teacher. It has been said that assessment drives instruction (Resnick & Resnick, 1990), but it may drive it the wrong way. Teachers not only teach with a view to assessment, but also are guided by a vision of what teaching is about, which is shaped by their own experiences as learners.

Challenging Curriculum

English language learners must have a challenging curriculum, specifically designed to meet their needs, adequate materials and resources, and ongoing monitoring of their progress.

There should be a specific distinct curriculum for English language development that follows high-level standards. This curriculum should cover the needs of beginning, intermediate, and advanced ELL students and have adequate materials and other resources to support English as a Second Language instruction. ELLs should be properly assessed and placed in English language development classes. In addition, to facilitate movement to higher-level classes when warranted, an ongoing system for monitoring individual student development should exist.

English language learners need access and opportunity to become engaged with the core curriculum in their native language or through sheltered English or Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) classes. (SDAIE classes are subject-matter classes taught in English, using mainstream materials and special scaffolding, to students who have developed an intermediate level of proficiency in English). SDAIE classes and courses taught in the students' native language (when a critical mass of these students is present in the school) should have the necessary materials and equipment for each student.

The curriculum should include advanced courses, for example chemistry, that are open to all students, including English language learners. In all classes, students should have opportunities to express their understandings by using extensive oral and written discourse. Through the curriculum and other practices and policies, schools should create stronger, long-term relationships between school staff and the children and families with whom they work.

Advantages to Establishing Standards for English Language Learners

One of the primary advantages to establishing content, performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards for English language learners is that these standards can help teachers focus on what they value and on what they want students to know. The teaching of English language development has typically focused on the more atomistic components of language: sentence structure, grammar, and the learning of discrete vocabulary terms. Even when the focus of English instruction has been on communication, teachers have often followed an unrelated sequence, rather than integrating the teaching of English into increasingly sophisticated levels of language and meaningful discourse. It is just as important to assist ELL students in their communication skills as it is to help them achieve high content standards. Depth of knowledge refers to the number of linked concepts a student has in a domain. In this sense, the extent to which concepts are interconnected reveals the coherence and richness of a student's understanding in a particular domain. It is critical to emphasize the importance of these connections; otherwise, when the different types of knowledge the learner possesses are disconnected, they will remain inert and unusable.

Another advantage to establishing standards for the education of English language learners is that they can lay the foundation for developing coherent ELL curricula — which can lessen the need to use materials and practices designed for younger students or for special education students. It is currently common practice to use materials that were designed for lower grades in the teaching of ELLs. There are vast discrepancies between the curricula offered to

English speakers and English learners (Gándara, 1997; META, 1995; Minicucci & Olsen, 1992). Since there is no set of standards for English language development or for the performance of ELLs in subject-matter classes, the curricula for these students vary tremendously.

Clear standards establish the content and level of performance expected of students. The existence of content standards will make it impossible for teachers to over-emphasize lower order, decontextualized skills and will guide them to richer, more accelerated teaching/learning situations.

Still another advantage to establishing standards for ELL students is the resulting increased communication among English language development teachers and other teachers, which can open up opportunities for teaching across disciplines. The process of developing, implementing, and revising standards should be iterative; that is, there should be significant planning, monitoring, and revision over time. Thus, as standards are adopted and refined at school sites, an ongoing dialogue among teachers can take place; in addition, professional discourse about practices with ELLs can develop that focuses on what schools should teach and ELLs should learn.

Another advantage to establishing standards for English language learners is that these standards can help determine English proficiency levels for students and help facilitate student movement from one class to another. There is a tendency in the system to perceive ESL courses as academic courses that students must complete in order to move on to more advanced offerings. Rather than basing advancement on course completion alone, decisions should be based on individual progress (which varies greatly among students). In practice, courses set up to help ELLs end up being traps for them, delaying and, in most cases, impeding their progress to higher and more demanding courses (Valdes, 1998; Walqui, 1999). If progress were measured by the achievement of standards, one could conceive of ELLs moving through three courses in the time it would have taken them to complete one, thus responding to the learning needs of individual students.

Assessment of English Language Learners

Regardless of the type, tests have an impact on individuals, policies, or practices in the classroom, the school, the education system, and society as a whole (Wall, 1997). Washback, also known as backwash, can be used as a synonym for impact, although its use generally refers to changes in teaching and learning caused by tests. Little empirical work has been undertaken to investigate whether washback really exists or what forms it might take (Alderson & Wall, 1993; Sizer, 1992). Nonetheless, it is generally assumed that "high-stakes" tests[2] influence teachers and students. There are many claims about the power of tests to affect what goes on in the classroom. However, the literature in language and general education offers few descriptions of the types of tests that are said to have this power.

[2] High-stakes tests are defined by Madaus (1988) as "those whose results are seen—rightly or wrongly—by students, teachers, administrators, parents, or the general public as being used to make important decisions that immediately and directly affect them" (p. 87).

Norm-referenced tests negatively impact English language learners since they condemn some to fail and do not provide feedback that students can use to perform better in the future. On the other hand, authentic assessments (criterion referenced) can be powerful tools for student self-assessment if the criteria for success are publicly announced and available for student self-monitoring. This positive impact is demonstrated by three examples of beneficial authentic assessment and standards-based practice presented toward the end of this paper.

Much has been said about the impact of tests on teachers' performance, especially about the fact that good assessments drive teachers' teaching in valuable and substantive ways. Some researchers, however, suggest that teachers may attend to tests not because they help their practice but because they must attend to tests to placate outside interests (Secada, 1992).

In Madaus' (1988) view, the higher the stakes associated with a test, the more it will distort the teaching process. In contrast, Crooks (1988) offers the view that classroom evaluation activities can have a positive effect on learning if instead of emphasizing "surface learning" they focus on "deep learning," if instead of using assessment to judge students, assessment assists them by setting high but attainable standards, and if the tasks used to evaluate students suit the goals assessed. Smith (1991) found that the publication of test scores makes teachers very sensitive and, as a result, more willing to alter their teaching to better prepare their students for the test, even if they do not believe in the tests. This practice seems to be more prevalent with low-income students (Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, & Educational Policy, 1992, quoted in Garcia & Pearson, 1994). Indeed, this is an area in which differing opinions abound.

Assessments are used with English language learners for at least three different purposes: (1) identifying, placing and exiting students out of English language services; (2) monitoring student progress; and (3) measuring school effectiveness. The discussion that follows primarily addresses the monitoring of student progress, the difference between norm-referenced tests and criterion-referenced assessments in terms of their application to ELLs, and the link between authentic assessment and teaching/learning.

Before beginning that discussion, however, it is important to note that students should be assessed in the language in which they are instructed. Many times, in an effort to help students, teachers give them tests in their native language, even though instruction took place exclusively in English. As students acquire new concepts in English, they also develop ways of talking and writing about them in English, not in their native language.

Norm-Referenced Testing

Norm-referenced testing relates individual test performance to other individuals taking the test, with the objective of rank ordering. In the majority of cases, norm-referenced tests focus on right and wrong answers and test very limited levels of thinking and language. Because such testing historically has tended to focus much of its research on comparative statistical procedures for the analysis of test items, it has given the impression of being concerned only with objective testing or with paper-and-pencil tests with items that can be scored "right" or "wrong." (Lynch &

Davidson, 1997). Norm-referenced tests suffer from a number of biases that are especially relevant in their application to English language learners: norming bias, content bias, and consequential validity.

By its very nature, the norming process leans toward mainstream culture since minority group samples are underrepresented in probability samples of the nation, and because the items on which low-scoring students score comparatively well disappear from the final versions of most tests (Garcia & Pearson, 1994). In order to score at the mean, an English language learner must outperform native English-speaking students; as Gándara (1997) explains, this is unlikely on tests that are dependent on language skills.

Test content and procedures suffer from content bias when they reflect "the dominant culture's standards of language function and shared knowledge and behavior" (Tyler & White, 1979) and implicitly define success according to their values and criteria. Some of this is done blatantly, as when a child who speaks little or no English is tested in this language. At other times, however, content bias occurs in more subtle ways, as when the "correct" answer directly contradicts the values, practices, and beliefs prized by the English language learner's culture. The following example illustrates this point.

In a vocabulary and reading test for students of English as a Second Language, comprehension is tested by multiple choice questions. Table 5.2 shows an excerpt from a literature selection in the test. According to the test developers, the correct answer is A. However, in many cultures it would be considered quite rude (B) to challenge an older person. Thus, it is possible for a student to understand the linguistic prompt in a test, but not the intended cultural implication. The impact of cultural differences in testing situations, although recognized in the literature, is not reflected in actual tests.

The example shown in Table 5.2 illustrates the unfairness of evaluating students who were socialized into different cultural and linguistic practices, norms, and beliefs on their ability to use another culture's practices unless they have explicitly been taught these practices. In the United States, this recommendation is as valid for native minorities, such as Native Americans or African American students (Delpit, 1995), as it is for foreign-born minorities and their native-born children (Reyes, 1992). Unfortunately, adequate support or teaching before testing is not offered to ELLs, with the dire consequence that they are over-represented in lower-track courses (Harklau, 1994).

Table 5.2
SAMPLE TEST QUESTION

Johnny, son of Scully, in a tone which defined his opinion of his ability as a card player, challenged the old farmer of both gray and sandy whiskers to a game of high-five. The farmer agreed with a contemptuous and bitter scoff.

The pertinent question on this passage reads as follows:

When Johnny spoke he sounded -

A. self-confident
B. quite rude
C. very polite
D. rather angry

Note: From "Cultural Knowledge and Reading," by M. Steffensen and C. Joag-Dev, 1984, in *Reading in a Foreign Language* (pp. 48-64). London and New York: Longman.

Consequential validity refers to evaluating the effects of the test on the lives of students, both in and out of school. Historically, tests have been used for ELLs as gatekeepers; consequently, students often are placed in special programs, impeding their graduation from high school and denying them entrance into desirable and economically rewarding jobs (Garcia & Pearson, 1994). As previously mentioned, immigrant students are over-represented in lower-track courses, which leads to a vicious circle of low expectations, low achievement, and, for English language learners at the secondary level, a school schedule that does not provide them with the requirements needed to apply to higher education (Vigil, 1993).

Criterion-Referenced Testing

Criterion-referenced assessments aim to relate individual test performance to a well-defined skill, behavior, or area of knowledge (Lynch & Davidson, 1997). The establishment of clear content and performance standards in the education of English language learners sets up the prerequisites for criterion-referenced testing, since students' performances or products can be judged against the standard. In this situation, the ELL is also judged against his or her own prior performance, and the assessment informs both the learner and the teacher. As the authors of one study (Lynch & Davidson, 1997) explain:

> Criterion-referenced assessments can provide the level of detail needed to monitor student progress, would allow for the assessment of student performance in

relation to instructional objectives, and would therefore also be useful in program evaluation. (p. 264)

Authentic Assessment with English Language Learners

O'Malley and Valdez Pierce (1996) define authentic assessment as "the multiple forms of assessment that reflect student learning, achievement, motivation, and attitudes on instructionally relevant classroom activities" (p. 4). Examples of authentic assessment include the use of portfolios, senior projects, experiments, debates, and inquiries.

Characteristics of Valuable Authentic Work

There are a number of criteria that authentic work must meet in order to be considered valuable. A few are listed below:

1. Criteria are made public, discussed with students prior to their use in the classroom, and refined over time on the basis of these discussions and teachers' discussions with colleagues.

2. Students use the published criteria to assess their own work and that of their peers.

3. Students revise their work to move it closer to meeting quality criteria.

4. Work revision is scaffolded by collaboration with peers and teachers.

5. Within the established classroom culture, students (and the teacher) view themselves as learners, teachers, and researchers, responsible to themselves and to the community.

Having clear, public criteria for assessing the work of ELLs fosters student autonomy in reaching higher levels of achievement. Traditionally, students have not known why teachers assign them certain grades. In fact, sometimes they feel that teachers' grading is unfair because they cannot see a rationale for a peer getting a higher grade. Assessing work based on rubrics, for example, can make the difference between trivial and significant work. (For an illustration, see the section "The Typical High School," which discusses the role of rubrics.)

Collections of student work are not only useful to students for monitoring their own linguistic, conceptual, and academic development, but also can serve as powerful tools for teachers' professional development. As teachers examine the products of English language learners, they can develop the capacity to inquire sensitively and systematically into the nature of learning and the effects of teaching (Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1997).

The emphasis on authentic forms of assessment such as portfolios, performances, and exhibitions attempts "to blur the edges separating learning, teaching, and assessment" (Warren &

Rosebery, 1992, p. 296). Authentic forms of assessment recognize that learning is situated. Authentic assessments engage students in complex, multidimensional activities that are representative of the work in a particular discipline.

Authentic Assessment in Action

The following three scenarios are offered as examples of authentic assessment in action. First, we consider the "typical" high school, followed by International High School in Queens, New York, and, finally, the Senior Project at Calexico High School in California.

The "typical" high school: The dilemma of having students draw their understandings. An ongoing concern in the education of English language learners is the superficiality of much that goes on in their classes because many teachers consider ELLs "nice" but basically incapable of substantial and thoughtful work since they cannot use sophisticated English to express themselves. This point was made poignantly several years ago when I visited a teacher's Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) freshman English class. There were 28 students in the class, most of who were Mexican Americans who spoke an intermediate level of English. The teacher was reading aloud a selection from Steinbeck's The Pearl, which I thought the students would find enticing.

However, I noticed that no one seemed to be too happy or interested in the novel. After reading aloud for about four minutes, the teacher told the students that they would draw an "Open Mind" of Kino, a character in *The Pearl*. Students reacted with a bored sigh; a couple of them protested, "An Open Mind once again? We did one last week." Pretending that she did not hear the remark, the teacher passed around paper with a profile of a head drawn on it and colored pencils. Using the profile of the head, students had 30 minutes to draw their understanding of Kino's state of mind at that point in the novel. The teacher announced that Open Minds would be displayed on the walls of the classroom. Looking around the classroom, I saw other barely filled-out Open Minds decorating the room. As students started to work, pretended to work, or openly conversed with one another, the teacher approached the desk where I was seated and explained to me that this was a great activity since it allowed "students who could not speak English to draw their understandings." As she moved around the room trying to convince students to work, I asked the girl next to me how long the class had been reading *The Pearl*. Three months, she responded, and they had barely read half of the book. No wonder no one seemed to be keen on the book or the task.

An Open Mind can indeed be a good task for English language learners — for any student, for that matter — if clear, substantive criteria are established for its completion. While teaching a Methods of English Language and Content Instruction course in the masters program in education at Stanford University, I asked my students to work on a rubric to use for assessing whether student-produced Open Minds were "outstanding," "acceptable," or "in need of revision." I also asked them to make sure that students would have to use English to create their Open Minds. We used the Open Mind as part of a sequence of activities designed around a powerful poem. Table 5.3 displays the rubric that one student constructed for assessing students'

products. It required the use of two quotes, two original phrases, two symbols, and two drawings to represent a character's state of mind at a specific point in the story.

We tried the rubric in class ourselves, producing Open Minds in collaborative groups of four, posting them, and then evaluating them according to the pre-set criteria. As students applied the rubric, they realized that it was a valuable tool for accountability, self-monitoring, and improvement. A few days later, most of them adapted the rubric for use in their classes to get their students to self-assess and to assess each other in productive terms.

The Open Mind is just one task in an orchestrated sequence that helps English language learners engage in longer pieces of reading and writing on their own, by using collaborative support and various degrees of teacher intervention.

International High School. At International High School in Queens, New York, a school for immigrant students, authentic assessment is deeply embedded into all activities. Students and teachers alike keep portfolios of their practices and the seams that bind learning. Assessment and the teacher-developed curriculum is organized into 12 interdisciplinary, thematic modules that make it possible for students to accrue the credits they need for graduation. Collaboration is essential for second language learners since in order to develop language, they need to have opportunities to use the language in meaningful, purposeful, and enticing interactions. Collaborative work, however, needs to provide every student with substantial and equitable opportunities to participate in open exchange and elaborated discussions; it must move beyond simplistic conceptions that assign superficial roles to second language learners.

In the Global Studies and Art components of the Structures interdisciplinary cluster, students were researching a world religion. At the beginning of the project, students were asked to select a religion that was unfamiliar to them and to become experts in it. They also were told that they would have to create or re-create a religious artifact typical of the religion, an activity that would be explained during the project's culminating performance. Throughout the project, students worked collaboratively and individually to develop an understanding of their chosen topic, learning and scaffolding for each other so they could perform beyond their initial level of competence. The tasks did not involve learners in routine procedures, but, rather, presented them with problems that had ill-structured solutions, with no single correct answer or standard set of steps (Cohen, 1994). Students were free to choose the theme they would investigate and the focus of their investigation. Students were not given specific questions to be answered. Instead, they were encouraged to approach the task from a personal perspective. To kick off the project, scenes from the film *Little Buddha* were shown and discussed, after which, working collaboratively, students brainstormed questions that might guide their research.

Questions generated by the groups were collected and distributed to the class in order to support students who might need further direction.

Other project activities included visiting a museum that exhibits religious artifacts, researching in dyads, and several opportunities to communicate their research in progress to peers. For example, a few days before the project was completed, students were asked to work

with a partner to study another religion and to interview each other about their research. This interview served two primary purposes: to inform each student in class about a religion that he or she had not researched, and to informally assess the quality of each student's work. Questions that were not clearly explained or that remained unanswered could now help further define the scope of the work or provide further lines of inquiry for the remaining days.

On the day of the final performance, students sat at tables of six (where each student had researched a different religion) and prepared by sharing their findings. After each presentation, students asked questions and clarified what they were learning. The project's culminating activity was an informal conversation in yet another grouping so that students could learn about other perspectives and about religion in general. This time, five or six students sat at each table with an adult (a teacher, a student teacher, an aide, or a visitor), artifacts in hand, ready to listen to each other and engage in discussion. Although students had their carefully constructed, written reports at hand, they could not rely on them for their initial presentations or during the discussion. The written part of the project consisted of a report, an essay, or a poster. The instructions that students had received emphasized that they should use their own words to demonstrate what they had learned.

In this complex sequence of tasks, collaboration was working at many different levels. Dyadic interaction provides the initial focus that is then bounced off the collaborative efforts of the whole class as represented by the list of questions distributed to all students. During the research process, there were many opportunities for students to work collaboratively and to exchange work in progress (such as when students exchanged different types of expertise as they worked in groups of four or five in a modified version of the jigsaw format). In this case, by exchanging ideas and information, students benefited because they had meaningful opportunities to explain and sharpen their English language skills and understandings; by listening to others, they developed creative solutions to their own assignment; and by discussing details of their work, they discovered principles that underlie diverse religious manifestations.

Table 5.3
Open Mind Diagram - Assessment Criteria

Performance Indicators	Outstanding	Passing	Needs Revision
Content	• Includes two or more relevant quotations from the poem • Includes two or more phrases that snythesize important ideas related to the character chosen • Includes two or more drawings which communicate relevant ideas about the character's situation • Includes two or more symbols that convey the character's ideas • As a whole, the open mind successfully communicates the chosen character's point of view or state of mind	• Includes one relevant quotation from the poem • Includes phrases based on the reading of the poem that represents some non-central ideas related to the chosen character • Includes one or two drawings that are not central to the character's situation • Includes one or more symbols that convey ideas that are not central to the character • As a whole, the open mind partially communicates point of view or state of mind	• Lacks one or more of the following: - quotations - phrases - symbols - drawings • The words and pictures are unrelated to the project idea • Open mind diagram does not communicate the character's point of view or state of mind
Presentation	• Each member of the group contributes to open mind and verbal presentation as docent • Open mind uses a creative design and creative working to persuade the viewer of character's point of view or state of mind • Open mind effectively uses color or shading • Open mind is neat	• Each member of the group contributes to the poster • Open mind uses color and shading • Open mind is neat	• One or more members of the group as not contributed to either the open mind or the verbal presentation • Open mind does not use color or shading • Open mind is sloppy

Note: From *Poverty in America: Who are the poor and why are they poor*. By T. Kini, 1998, Thematic unit developed for Education 284, Stanford Teacher Education Program, Stanford University.

Assessment is an integral part of complex teaching/learning for second language learners. In the two previous examples, as students engaged in the construction of their cognitive and linguistic development, they were continually self-assessing and assessing the work of their peers. Assessment should not be something that only teachers do, but something that learners do for themselves and for each other as well. There is considerable research that supports the importance of learner self-monitoring in the efficient development of second languages (O'Malley & Chamot, 1989; Oxford, 1990; Rubin & Thompson, 1982).

The Senior Project at Calexico High School. Another way of looking at assessment is the learner's evaluation of his or her own cognitive development. This section considers how this use of assessment was applied at Calexico High School in California, where 68 percent of the students are immigrants and have limited proficiency in English. In 1993, Calexico High School introduced the "Senior Project" as a graduation requirement. The three-part project engaged students in the following tasks:

1. writing a research paper on a topic of their choice;

2. applying the knowledge and skills acquired during their research and general education to the development of a product or to their involvement in some action; and

3. making an oral presentation to a board of judges in which students demonstrate their knowledge and skills, integrating the academic and experiential components of the project. The board of judges, a committee made up of five adults (three teachers and two community members), questions students to assess the depth of their academic and applied knowledge.

A visit to the school found Eréndira, a lively, young woman from Mexicali, working on a comparison of the digital and traditional processes of photography development for her Senior Project. Because she was in her third year of ESL classes, Eréndira was required to write her paper in English. (First- and second-year ESL students could write their papers in Spanish.) During the research phase of her project, she consulted libraries, apprenticed with a well-known photographer from the community, and worked extensively with peers and teachers. She documented her learning process in writing and with a video. She also had learned to edit her demonstration video with a teacher. This provided her with a considerable amount of individual time with a teacher she respected. It also offered her an ideal opportunity to develop more sophisticated English language skills as she discussed, reformulated, and advanced her project with the teacher.

The Senior Project is an authentic assessment task because it engages students in self-directed learning, in the construction of their own knowledge through disciplined inquiry, and in the analysis of problems that have value beyond the school and that will be co-constructed and shared with people beyond the school (Newmann, Secada, & Wehlage, 1995). Indeed, as Eréndira (personal communication, 1997) told me a week before her final presentation:

> I had always been intrigued by photography, and the project gave me the opportunity to find out about it. I have learned so much: about the photographic process, to develop films, to produce a video, to edit sequences . . . I have learned a lot of new concepts, and the words to talk about them in English.

Furthermore, the teachers at Calexico High School, working in groups and continually revising and editing their work, developed rubrics for students to use during self-assessment and

peer-assessment prior to handing in their projects to their advisors. By the time the project was presented, it had been revised several times. Students could feel satisfied that their work met the standard.

Conclusion

Although not without its problems, the inclusion of English language learners in standards-based reform and authentic assessment can improve the quality of the education they receive if, together with content and performance standards, opportunity-to-learn standards are given center stage. Two critical issues remain unanswered by the research:

1. At what point in the development of ESL standards do students move into mainstream subject-matter courses conducted in English? Does this transition come at different moments depending on the discipline? It used to be common sense that English language learners were first transitioned into math and science, and then into social students and language arts courses, but this scheme was based on the assumption that math and science are highly visual courses that do not require extensive reading or writing. That is no longer the case — the need for robust literacy skills is required in these areas as well. Research is needed in this area to facilitate understanding of when these transitions should occur and under what circumstances.

2. Professional development should be thought of as a lifelong process for teachers. As societal and life conditions change, so do the needs of teachers. These changes must be continually addressed. The post-modern age is a time of the "collapse of certainty in received wisdom and established beliefs" (Hargreaves, 1995, p. 57), requiring the formulation of varied answers. Each of these answers will need to be considered and validated in the particular situation. It is no longer possible to design a staff development program that applies equally well across many varying contexts. The professional growth of teachers must be ongoing and transformational, with teacher input guiding its content. This input could very well be how good, substantive standards inform practice and how practice guides the assessment of linguistic, conceptual, and academic development in English language learners.

The 21st Century will require increasingly more sophisticated skills from high school graduates. Unless we begin to develop standards and authentic assessments for English language learners, we are condemning them to a third-rate life from which it will be very difficult to escape.

Discussion Questions

1. Has the presence of English language learners changed in your context? If yes, how?

2. What new demands are these recent arrivals placing on the system?

3. In general, how do teachers and administrators in your district feel about standards-based reform?

4. In your opinion, what are some of the "stumbling blocks" in establishing standards in the education of English language learners?

5. What arguments, and in what format, can you use to work with reluctant educators? What strategies can be used to change attitudes and ensure inclusion of English language learners in the standards-based reform process?

6. Is your district currently using authentic assessment for CLD and English language learners? If so, how ready are the staff to initiate such a process?

7. In your opinion, what negative reactions can be anticipated in implementing authentic assessment for English language learners? In your state? District?

8. What possible strategies can be used to initiate authentic assessment for immigrant or non-English-speaking students?

References

Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? *Applied Linguistics 14*(2), 115-129.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1993). *A blueprint for the second generation*. Report of the Stanford Working Group. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1998). *Educating language-minority children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

August, D., Hakuta, K., & Pompa, D. (1994). *For all students: Limited English proficient students and Goals 2000*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Brown, A., & Campione, J. (1994). Guided discovery in a community of learners. In K. McGilly (Ed.), *Classroom lessons: Integrating cognitive theory and research* (pp.229-273). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

California Department of Education. (1997). *California language arts standards*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Cohen, E. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational Research, 64*(1), 1-35.

Crooks, T. J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. *Review of Educational Research 58*(4),438-481.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, again. *Educational Researcher, 19*, 3-13.

Darling-Hammond, L., Ancess, J., & Falk, B. (1995*). Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ball, D. L. (1997*). Teaching for high standards: What policy makers need to know and be able to do* (Online). Prepared for the National Education Goals Panel. Available: http://www.negp.gov/Reports/highstds.html.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people 's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.

Freire, P. (1974). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

Gándara, P. (1997). *Review of research on instruction of Limited English Proficient students*. Davis, CA: University of California, Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Garcia, E., & Pearson, D. (1994). Assessment and diversity. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education, 20* (pp. 337-391). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Greenwald, R., Hedges, L. V., & Laine, R. D. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research 66*(3), 361-396.

Hargreaves, A. (1995). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Harklau, L. (1994). Tracking and linguistic minority students: Consequences of ability grouping for second language learners. *Linguistics and Education, 6*, 217-244.

Heath, S. B. (1995). *Facing the facts of life, literacy, and work*. Keynote address at the Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.

Kaplan, R. (1997). Foreword. Palmam qui meriut ferat. In W. Eggington & H. Wren (Eds.), *Language policy: Dominant English, pluralist challenges* (pp. xi-xxiii). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kini, T. (1998). *Poverty in America: Who are the poor and why are they poor?* Thematic unit developed for Education 284, Stanford Teacher Education Program, Stanford University.

Koretz, S., Madaus, G., Haertel, E., & Beaton, A. (1992). *National educational standards and testing: A response to the recommendations of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing Congressional testimony*. Santa Monica, CA: Institute on Education and Training, RAND.

Kozol, J. (1988). *Savage inequalities*. New York: Crown.

Lacelle-Peterson, M., & Rivera, C. (1994). Is it real for all kids? A framework for equitable assessment policies for English language learners. *Harvard Educational Review, 64*(1) 55-75.

Li, J., & Bennett, N. (March 1988). *Young children in poverty: A statistical update*. (Online). National Center for Children in Poverty. Available: http://cpmcnet.columbia.edu/dept/nccp/98uptext.html

Lynch, B., & Davidson, F. (1997). Criterion referenced testing. In C. Clapham & D. Corson (Eds.), *Language testing and assessment: Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 7). Dordrecht, Boston, & London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Madaus, G. F. (1988). The influence of testing on the curriculum. In L. N. Tanner (Ed.), *Critical issues in curriculum: Eighty-seventh yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 83-121). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McLaughlin, M., & Shepard, L. (1995). *Improving education through standards-based reform. A report by the National Academy of Education Panel on Standards-Based Education Reform*. Stanford, CA: National Academy of Education.

META. (1995). *Programs for Limited English Proficient students in fifteen California secondary schools*. A report from Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Miller, S. L. (1995). *An American imperative: Accelerating minority educational advancement*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Minicucci, C., & Olsen, L. (1992). *Programs for secondary limited English Proficient students: A California study. Occasional papers in bilingual education*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Moss, M., & Puma, M. (1995). *Prospects: The congressionally mandated study of educational growth and opportunity: First-year report on language minority and limited English proficient students*. Prepared for Office of the Under Secretary, U. S. Department of Education.

National Center for Children in Poverty. (1998, March). *Young children in poverty: A statistical update*. (Online). Available: http://cpmcnet.columbia.edu/dept/nccp/98uptext.html

National Council on Education Standards and Testing. (1992). *Raising standards for American education: A report to Congress, the Secretary of Education, the National Education Goals Panel, and the American people*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Education Goals Panel. (1998). *The national education goals report: Building a nation of learners*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Newmann, F., Secada, W., & Wehlage, G. (1995). *A guide to authentic instruction and assessment: Vision, standards and scoring*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin at Madison.

New Standards Project. (1997a). *Performance standards: English language arts, mathematics, science, applied learning: Vol. 1. Elementary school*. Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy, and the University of Pittsburgh.

New Standards Project. (1997b). *Performance standards: English language arts, mathematics, science, applied learning: Vol. 3. High school*. Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy, and the University of Pittsburgh.

Olsen, L. (1995). School restructuring and the needs of immigrant students. In R. Rumbaut & W. A. Cornelius (Eds.), *California's immigrant children: Theory, research, and implications for educational policy* (pp. 209-232). San Diego: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.

O'Malley, M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.

Pallas, A., Natriello, G., & McDill, E. L. (1995). Changing students, changing needs. In E. Flaxman & A. H. Passow (Eds.), *Changing populations/changing schools. Ninety-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II* (pp. 30-58). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. (1996). *Immigrant America: A portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reyes, M. (1992, Winter). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically different students. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(4), 427-446.

Rubin, J., & Thompson, L. (1982). *How to be a good language learner*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Secada, W. (1992). Evaluating the mathematics education of limited English proficient students in a time of educational change. In U. S. Department of Education, *Proceedings of the Second National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on evaluation and measurement Vol. 2*, (pp. 209-256). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs.

Sizer, T. (1992, June). Eight questions: On cost, impact, the politics of who chooses. *Education Week*, pp. 4-5.

Smith, M. L. (1991). Put to the test: The effects of external testing on teachers. *Educational Researcher, 20*(5), 8-ll.

TESOL. (1997). *ESL Standards for pre-K-12 students*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Tyler, R., & White, S. (1979). Chairmen's report. In National Institute of Education, *Testing, teaching, and learning: Report of a conference on research in testing* (pp. 3-32). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1998). *Population estimates and projections*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Valdés, G. (1998). The world outside and inside schools: Language and immigrant children. *Educational Researcher, 27*(6), 4-22.

Vigil, J. D. (1993). Gangs, social control and ethnicity. In S. B. Heath & M. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Identity and inner city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender* (pp. 94-119). New York: Teachers College Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wall, D. (1997). Impact and washback in language testing. In C. Clapham & D. Corson (Eds.), Language testing and assessment. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, Vol. 7, (pp. 291-302). Dordrecht, Boston & London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Walqui, A. (1999). *Access and Engagement: Program design and instructional approaches for immigrant students in secondary schools*. Chicago: Delta Systems and the Center for Applied Linguistics.

Warren, B., & Rosebery, A. (1992). Science education as a sense-making practice: Implications for assessment. In U. S. Department of Education, *Proceedings of the Second National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on evaluation and measurement*, Vol. 2, (pp. 273-304). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs.

Warren, B., & Rosebery, A. (1995). Equity in the future tense: Redefining relationships among teachers, students, and science in linguistic minority classrooms. In W. Secada, E. Fennema, & L. Adajian (Eds.), *New directions for equity in mathematics education* (pp. 298-328). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wolf, D., & Reardon, S. (1996). Access to excellence through new forms of student assessment. In J. Boykoff Baron & D. Palmer Wolf (Eds.), *Performance-based student assessment: Challenges and possibilities* (pp. 1-31). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

An examination of the papers presented and ensuing discussions at the first diversity roundtable suggested five major areas in which educators can initiate or strengthen actions to improve the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLD) in a standards-based system:

1. beliefs and attitudes;
2. policies and procedures for inclusion;
3. accountability in a standards-based system;
4. professional development; and
5. unique needs of special populations.

Beliefs and Attitudes

A change in beliefs and attitudes toward CLD students would certainly be a step in the right direction to successfully including such students in standards-based reform. Educators should take steps to increase their awareness of CLD students' unique needs and to examine their perceptions and beliefs about these students' abilities. Without such examination, the basic tenet of standards-based education that "all students can learn" will not be upheld. In addition, if we are serious about including CLD students in standards-based reform, we must value their cultural and linguistic diversity. As the authors and roundtable participants suggested, one way to show that we value this diversity is to view bilingualism as an asset and a resource. As a nation we have not traditionally reaped the benefits of diversity, including bilingualism. Instead we have politicized issues related to diversity and, thus, have lost opportunities to enhance our lives.

The papers and discussions make it evident that educators should set and maintain high expectations for all students. To make a difference in children's lives, it is important for teachers, administrators, counselors and other staff members, parents, and other community members to convey the strong belief that each and every child has the potential to meet high standards and achieve his or her dreams.

Policies and Procedures for Inclusion

It is critical to consider the needs of CLD students from the beginning of the planning phase for restructuring, rather than as an afterthought. When planning instructional programs or developing procedures and policies, the needs of all students should be a primary focus. School,

leaders and teachers would be wise to select or adapt curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of CLD students.

One step that schools and teachers could take is to recognize the perspectives and contributions of CLD populations and incorporate authentic learning opportunities into the classroom. As Demmert suggests, the school environment should promote the cultures of the student population and represent the contributions of the community the school serves. It is also important for decision-making groups, including policymakers, commissioners of education, superintendents, boards of education, administrators, and teachers to reflect the culture(s) of the community and student population. Positive role models who reflect students' culture(s) can powerfully influence the learning and achievement of students.

Accountability in a Standards-Based System

In a standards-based system, states and districts usually hold schools accountable for the achievement of all students. In order to meet accountability requirements, many schools may need to make major shifts in the education of CLD students. As Walqui suggests, one shift is developing content, performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards (or using existing ones) to improve the quality of schooling for such students. Another strategy is to coordinate planning and increase communication among all instructional staff who work directly or indirectly with CLD students. For example, staff members responsible for assessing students can look for opportunities to communicate with staff members who are responsible for multicultural education. Classroom teachers can be encouraged to communicate with ESL teachers. In any case, all staff members should be reinforced for taking responsibility for all students.

Aligning curriculum, instructional practices, and assessment can greatly improve the achievement of CLD students. Specifically, teachers may want to consider using a balanced approach for teaching English. In addition, they should be encouraged to link instructional practice with evaluation strategies, especially in the area of English as a Second Language. Integrating all forms of communication, structuring them into a meaningful format, and including higher-order thinking skills can be very beneficial for all students.

To further support the success of all students, schools may want to establish a systematic and consistent means of data collection and analysis. Administrators may want to disaggregate data to help staff determine the needs and monitor the progress of all students. A variety of assessment strategies also will help teachers accurately measure the progress of CLD students.

Professional Development

When designing staff development opportunities for those who work with CLD students, staff developers must consider the skills required to help all students achieve success and meet high standards. As Calderón reminds us, some staff members may need bilingual skills as well as skills in developing standards and assessments for language minority students. Others may need

training in cooperative learning, communication building, concept development, team building, self-reflection, or self-esteem. Still others may need strategies for working with parents, strategies for helping students use higher-order thinking skills' or strategies for helping language minority students acquire literacy skills. School districts must provide high-quality professional development for all instructional, support, and administrative personnel who have CLD students in their district or school population. Institutions of higher education must provide experiences that help educators acquire the knowledge and skills they need to work successfully with all students. State departments of education and technical assistance centers must be prepared to provide specific strategies to assist all schools, including rural and isolated schools, in addressing the needs of CLD students.

Unique Needs of Special Populations

Recognizing the unique needs of Native American students and students from rural and isolated communities will help schools to address the inclusion of CLD students in standards-based reform. To understand the unique needs of Native American students, educators may want to explore how these students have been treated in the past and how they are affected by the difficult experiences they may still encounter in their daily lives, especially if they live on a reservation. Many Native American students have bilingual language needs because their native language is spoken at home even though at first glance it appears that many of them speak only English. In addition, as both Demmert and Nelson-Barber point out, the learning style of many Native American students differs from the traditional style they are expected to exhibit in today's classrooms.

Many rural and isolated communities are beginning to experience an influx of CLD students for the first time. Staff members who have neither worked with these populations nor had any professional development in this area may lack the capacity to address the needs of these students. At the same time, many of the schools and districts in these communities may lack the necessary resources to build staff capacity through professional development opportunities. They may be located a considerable distance from colleges or universities or lack the funding to hire an outside expert or to hire their own professional developer.

A Final Comment

After reading and reflecting on the writing of the four national experts, conducting the roundtable discussions, and reviewing participants' comments, it is clear that including culturally and linguistically diverse students in standards-based reform is a shared responsibility. Teachers, administrators, district assessment personnel, educators responsible for training current and new educators, state department of education staff, and educational laboratory staff all have a role in supporting this worthwhile and necessary effort. Although this endeavor is complex and will undoubtedly require many changes for educators, including these students in standards-based reform should truly be one of our top priorities if we are serious about preparing all students to succeed in the 21st century.